NOT NECESSARILY THE FEDERATION ARCHIVES
A ONE OF "ADDENDUM" PRIVATELY PUBLISHED
BY
LINDA TERRELL P O BOX 25 DUNEDIN FL 34697

FEBRUARY 1989

This ADDENDUM has been paid for by ME and as I'm a bit cash shy, you'll have to put up with a reduced format. There is a lot to say and finances dictate it be kept to as short as space as possible.

Since I had my say in the last FA, and, as a result, dragged 'innocent' fans into it, I figured it wasn't fair to shut the FA down to any replies I might get. What I actually meant to say - and do - was shut it down to any 'hate' mail I was sure I'd receive. Well, I didn't receive any (and I have my suspicions why - see ending editorial). The letters were sane, sensible, cohesive and adult. And these are what are printed in this 'Addendum'.

After all, I did pledge to bring you 'all sides'.

I paid for this ADDENDUM because I don't believe the members' money should be used to carry on what is basically a feud among the 'BNFs'.

Some have asked did I bother to write and ask Terry and Paul? Yes, I did. Terry replied very courteously, detailing the concept of fan-oriented 'pro' type money-making cons 'without BNF power struggles' because he and Paul would be in control, with Laurie Cohen backing. That the idea was to guarantee a 'salary' to the Guests - whom he and Paul would chose - in order to guarantee their appearanc; i.e. be able to refuse 'real work' (though getting paid by a Con is NOT 'real work'?) in England in order to attend. Also, that there would be writing and acting workshops; skits written by the actors and fans in which actors and fans would play roles.

Then they sent out Cohen & Co. who didn't make this clear!

Why Terry and Paul didn't come to the organizers *Up Front*, escapes me.

Paul, on the other hand, wrote me personally and outlined none of this except the 'salary' concept and being 'in control', then spent much of his time berating me for 'criticising' Janet (who had attacked me in November completely out of left fieeld for no other reason than *fan innuendo*. It works both ways!) and slapping me down for writing - gasp! - 'slash' without his permission.

He did not address the allegations I reported had been made against him.

I even offered him the FA for his own forum; that I'd put out a Special Edition!

As for going to Cohen & Co for 'verification': I haven't put much store in Ms. Cohen since 1986 when she lectured, berated, belittled and humiliated Paul in front of me at SCORPIO that year. She left the man trembling with anger.

Some of the other letters express outrage that I appear to be saying the actors *shouldn't* be paid' I have no objection to any actor requesting a *reasonable* fee of any *Fan Con*. 'Pro' type Cons are something else and whatever any actor can get out of them, go for it. I do not underwrite 'Pro' Cons. I find them usurous (especially when they are the only game in town) and the word 'Charity' is rarely on their agenda. Most Fan Cons donate some proceeds to a Charity.

I do NOT believe that any actor deserves $3000 to $5000 or even more (as has been suggested by some actors) PLUS expenses for any weekend. You're talking of upward of $8000 and more for ONE Guest - damn few Fan Cons can afford that. Would you rather have favorite Guests at several Cons that pay, say, $1500 - $2000 and expenses, or NO Cons at $5000 plus? Or 'Pro' Cons only?

Sure we see fans going home with armloads of zines and photos. Does anyone stop to consider that many fans only get to one 'Big' Con a year after saving and scrimping all year so they buy however much they can afford because this is their only Con?

Con Cons work nearly an entire year in not-so-spare-time. Sure, they 'volunteer', but without them, you'd have 'Pro' Cons only.

The Guests come in and work three intense *days*.

Ask around - how many Cons have the *Doctor Who* actors been invited to in the last few years? Many of them put themselves out of business by asking the same high fees plus expenses.

Katz is returning to the circuit - and he appears to be going multi-media. CREATIONS is primarily TREK. All that is left that is 'all B7' is Fan Run Cons.

Also, the article in the last FA were about 'attitudes'. I found the rather totalitarian attitudes that had been expressed to be altogether too much like 'do it my way or I'll take my fandom and go home.'

When some of us reacted negatively, the atmosphere from the U.K. became petulant. And, as regards some of the fan writers, notably those who write - gasp! - 'slash', the attitude from the U.K. is downright vindictive. (**eradicate' eradicate!**).

This ADDENDUM is a one and only. I cannot afford to put out addendums in reply to addendums. So if you have any letters you wish to write, please send them to the various Club newsletters - I will sully no more pages of the FA with any of this flap. The FA is returning to regularly schedulled programming now and forever.

LETTERS

ANN WORTHAM Altamonte Springs FL

As I promised Linda I would, I am writing to publicly admit my authorship of the 'Name Withheld' article published in the last FA. My reason for asking Linda to withhold my name was simple: I wished to spare the organizers of GAMBIT further abuse, such as they have suffered over the last year. I felt that my position on the convention committee would set my fellow committee members up as targets - and it seems I was right.

A number of people were aware that I wrote the article and someone ran straight to Paul Darrow and told him I wrote it. His response was to call up my close friends and threaten to 'destroy' me in fandom. He claimed he would show me 'what true power is.' His wife called me a 'vile woman'. None of this was said directly to me, you understand (and Paul has my phone number), but to my friends. Although my friends disagreed with Paul and tried to explain the situation to him, he is now telling everyone that my friends have 'abandoned' me and are in complete accord with him!

Furthermore, Paul has written an extremely libelous statement about me (which doesn't address the issues but rather attacks me personally), which he is distributing and asking people to print. I will refrain from commenting on it at length, but I *will* point out that Paul claims that I wrote my article because I was jealous over 'losing' his attention and that my ethics regarding conventions should be called into question. These claims are patently ridiculous and harmful only to himself. Laurie Cohen, the organizer of his tour, contacted me herself by phone and by letter, and asked me to serve on the executive committee of their tour! If I wanted Paul's attention, approval, etc., don't you think I would have *accepted*? The only conventions to date that I have worked for are SCORPIO (as head of *Fan* programming), run by Paul's supposed friends, Cherry Steffey and Nancy Kolar; and DSV (as head of *fan* programming and dealers' room liason), run by *Laurie Cohen* and Deb Walsh. At no time did I have *any* access to convention funds and did, in fact, bear most of the costs of running my departments out of my own personal funds. In fact, *all* of my personal expenses (airfare, hotel room, meals, etc.) were paid by me. In the upcoming year, I am serving in similar positions for GAMBIT (run by a group of people who helped Laurie Cohen run DSV last year), FREEDOM CITY (run by Marion McChesney), and SCORPIO. Again, I have absolutely no access to convention funds. My job is to provide fan programming for the *fans*. I rarely see the actors long enough at these events to say more than 'hi' and 'bye'. I'm usually too busy working to even see the programming *I've* scheduled.

Paul's letter quite blatantly blacklists me from conventions where he will be appearing. Does this sound like someone who *isn't* trying to control the fandom?

There also seems to be an attempt to persecute writers of slash fiction simply because they write something Paul and Janet don't approve of. I feel like I'm living iin Nazi Germany and I've dared to question *Der Fuehrer*. Janet has written to people saying, 'If the authors of slash fiction are proud of their work, why do they decline to append their reals names to it?' I would like to counter with, if Janet Lees Price and Paul Darrow are proud of *their* work, why do Paul and Janet act under stage names? Darrow is *not* Pauls's name. 'Why does anyone ever write under a pseudonym' Hundreds of professional writers do it every year and they all have their reasons. Aren't most of you aware that the majority of professionally published romance novels are written under pseudonyms? Janet and Paul seem to be ignoreing the issues of the current controversy in favor of focusing on their disapproval of slash literature. Rather telling, I think, when Paul has been accused of wanted to control the fandom that he responds by trying to throw his weight around in order to ... control the fandom!

I'm shutting up on this subject now because it's only upsetting me and those close to me. I gave you the facts, as they appeared to exist, in the last FA. Either Paul said those things quoted and/or the people representing his tour said those things ... or a lot of fans are lying for no reason other than to smear Paul's name and make him mad at them. Surely you can see how unlikely that is!

I believe the quotes were accurate. There has since been a press release from Paul, Terry and Laurie denying everything. Okay. If they changed their minds because of public outrage, then that's great. I *still* won't work for Laurie Cohen; I've been that route before. And, obviously, I can't attend their conventions since Paul has 'blacklisted' me; but it's possible the fans might have a nice time. That's all I'm interested in.

On another subject, since I am constant strain and pressure from my workload, have been hospitalized for surgery twice in the last four months, and am devoting so much time to helping three fan-run, I must cut back on something. I am also now apparently being accused by Ms. Cohen of making 'thousands' of dollars at conventions from sales of zines. My printer billes, etc., are available for inspection. But, I am getting tired of fighting these rumors. I am currently halfway through typing BLAKES DOUBLES #2. It will be available shortly. I hope to have a SOUTHERN COMFORT 5.5 available for *MediaWest*. SOUTHERN SEVEN #5 will follow. BLAKES DOUBLES #3 and SOUTHEPN SEVEN #6 will follow that. From there, I do not know. I'm so tired and disgusted that I seriously doubt I can continue once my obligations to my contributors are fulfilled. I am told there are 'scores' of people just waiting to step into my shoes. Have at it, guys, 'cos here's your chance. In a sense, Cohen and Co. have succeeded.

As soon as my current supply of reprints is depleted, I will no longer be providing mail-order reprints (I may provide a *few* reprints at conventions). Therefore, if you'd like any of the following, please order them as soon as possible or risk them being out of print: SOUTHERN SEVEN #1; SOUTHERN SEVEN #2; SOUTHERN SEVEN #3; BLAKES DOUBLES #1; LOG OF THE HELLHOUND, BOOK I; LOG OF THE HELLHOUND, BOOK II; JUST DESERTS #1; LAST STAND AT THE EDGE OF THE WORLD; SOUTHERN LIGHTS 2.5; SOUTHERN LIGHTS 3.5; SOUTHERN LIGHTS 3.75; SOUTHERN LIGHTS 4.5; SOUTHERN COMFORT 4.75. When SOUTHERN SEVEN #4 goes out of print, I doubt there will be reprints. I also anticipate the print run for BLAKES DOUBLES #2 to be smaller than normal.

Incidentally, I can say with impunity that a *pornographic, explicit* slash story has never appeared in print with my name on it. And if I write such things or anything else under a pseudonym, that's nobody's damned business but my own. I'm not known for shoving stories or zines, adult or otherwise, down the throats of people who don't want to see them!

My heartfelt thanks to all of the kind people who awarded LAST STAND AT THE EDGE OF THE WORLD, the novel Leah and I wrote, a Zen award as best novel for 1988. Thank you also for the Fan Quality (Fan Q) award garnered by SOUTHERN SEVEN #2. I'm very happy you have enjoyed our writing and hard work.

JEAN AIREY Aurora IL

I don't like people called 'anonymous' - and I certainly disagree with much of the attitude of the anonymous person who wrote the opening statement in the Dec-Jan FA. I lived through the days when DW guests came over for free - and now i've lived through the days when B7 guests came over for free. Why is it unreasonable for a guest to ask for a fee? The con takes them away from possible work for at least five days - maybe more - and while they might not be giving up a major production to do this, they are cutting themselvesoff from doing any voice-over work which typically comes up at the last minute. Additionally, they have expenses which they wind up paying out-of-pocket. Is there some law that a con which pays a guest fees must be a 'Creation'-type Con? The last several Time Festivals paid fees - and I believe that everyone involved had a great time, fans as well as guests. Consider too, that a 'guest' con is using the guests to get people to come to the con. If there were hundreds of people willing to come to a con just to sit and talk with each other, we'd see the guest names in tiny print at the bottom of the flier. i also find it interesing that you are calling for B7 guests to come without fees when they might be being asked to come to a con with a DW guest who is getting a fee! How about it, TARDISCON - did you pay Michael a fee equivalent to Colin's? Or did you figure you were getting off cheap by having him come without one? Did he work as hard as Colin? What did he get for it compared to what Colin got? From Anon's comments, I can only judge that 'it' was around when Paul (let's not play games here) was talking to a small group - did Anon say anything to Paul about what he was (supposedly) saying? Anon seems perfectly willing to quote lots of people - all of whom also remain 'anonymous'. As for Paul's (reported) statement about '75 seconds with the fans' - surely this was being said sarcastically - damnit, this is the guy who sits out in hotel lobbies and plays Trivial Pursuit with the fans! Who obviously took time at this convention to get together with people outside of his con-scheduled events! And the comment about 'certain Actors at SCORPIO' - is this referring to Paul? I believe he was working the last two years - does Anon want him to take five days off without pay to attend a convention? -- and a convention that does not pay a fee? I should point out that not only does SCORPIO not pay a fee, but to individuals who have attended other conventions where they were free to decide who they wanted to be with and when, the SCOPPIO 'sponsor' system might be a bit more confining than they find 'amusing'. So, fine - is there something wrong with a convention deciding how it is going to run (fee/nofee/profit/non-profit) and a guest deciding what they want to come to it? If you don't like it, don't go!

(The following is a critical comment based on your statement that it is appropriate to criticize an individual's function. It is a comment on your function

What amazes me, Linda, is that you have published this and your own ensuing comments without waiting to get a response from Paul or Terry on these (reported) convention plans. You have gone to press with anonymous, iresponsible, possibly libelous rumors - all seemingly calculated to harm one particular individual - Paul - conveniently ignoring the fact that the *idea* for a series of traveling conventions seems to be coming from both Paul and Terry. You report the blow-up in DW fandom between myself and Barbara Elder - who, incidently was not a "BNF" - but the BBC licensing agent for North America. Yes, she did propose, verbally, at a con, that she was going to issue an edict regarding publication of DW zines - primarily that they would have to be approved by her prior to publication. I argued, to her face (unlike Anon), that I disagreed with the idea - and I also took time at the con to speak to a representative of the BBC who was there. I *never* went to print with any discussion of the disagreement - or of any of the other disagreements that flamed up in DW fandom either in my own newsletter or in the *Fantasy Empire* column. I felt that disagreements between people should be settled between the people and that open flammage would only hurt the fandom as a whole in the long run. I knew what I believed and was willing to argue for it, up front, in person - and without much support from other fans - such as you, Linda, as you mention. There are a lot of other ways you could have expressed your concern with these report you were hearing than the ways you have chosen. I only hope you give the people you've been bashing a forum to present their side and to tell everyone exactly what they were thinking.

And, in case you wonder why people think you have a "Paul/Avon" problem, look at Leigh Arnold's letter - she is doing an excellent analysis of the often-made statemtnt that "Avon is psyshotic". She was not saying anything about Blake - and you come in in the middle of her analysis as if she had been!

I've written to Jean apologizing for bringing her name into this, although I thought at the time, I was referring to very ancient DW history as the argument between her and Elder took place at OMNICON in 1983.

As a total neo at that time and at that Con, I saw Jean and Elder as "BNFs". What Elder may have actually been, didn't make much of a dent at the time. I only knew her as a "BNF" in DW fandom and there was Jean holding down the constitutional fort, arguing against what she clearly saw as censorship. I didn't "take sides" because as a total neo to that fandom and to fandom in general (that was my absolutely first "Big" Con!), I didn't feel I should even open my mouth to them! I was virtually in shock the entire time!

I have also apologized to Leigh Arnold for over-stepping my bounds and interrupting her. It was rude of me.

I printed Annie's letter "name withheld by request" because I knew who it was from and I believed the contents to be true based on three separate conversations with other people which corroborated various parts of it.

Therefore, I printed Annie's letter on the condition that she write and tell everyone she wrote it! This she has done.

By the way, it was the RABBLE ROUSERS of St. Louis, NOT the CIA or TARDISCON who raised money to pay for Michael Keating's airfare. They also paid to bring over his daughter.

MICHAEL DEMPSEY Norwich CT

Your editorial on Fan vs Pro Cons would have packed more weight if names had been named, et al... facts: names, places, dates - are more effective than generalities.

BARBARA FRANJEVIC Westmont IL

The Great Fandom Flap - meaning the alleged proposed "pro" cons to be put on by A Certain Actor, et al: the East Coast seems to be saying He is a jerk, and a greedy, *stupid*, threacherous one at that. The West Coast thinks he's Mr. Wonderful and the GFF is all nothing but a sinister plot on the part of disgruntled BNFs. And here we in the Midwest sit, literally in the middle since I, at least, have at this point no clear reason to mistrust either side. People (on both sides) keep telling me, "But you *know* such-and-such!" and I don't. I'm relatively new to fandom, just got into it all about four years ago and this is my first experience with this kind of thing. So far as cons are concerned, I'm one of the faceless herd that just pays their registrations, goes and has a good time. And that's all I want.

One question occurs to me, on this matter of "suject to professional committments". That's always specified at fan cons. If he's going to do these "pro" cons of his own, what about that? Are we to assume that he would pass up an opportunity of a (possibly long term) acting job in order to be at a few weekend cons? Or that he would risk torpedoing his "own" cons by backing out at the last minute, thereby alienating theoretical large numbers of impressionable people who have theoretically paid large amounts of money, primarily to see *him*? either way, it doesn't make sense.

And, a "stable" of exclusive Guests, hm? Interesting choice of term...

I would respectfully disagree, however, with the suggestion that future B7 cons become British Media Cons instead. Again speaking for no one but myself, I am a BLAKES 7 fan, not a general media fan. If the unhappy day comes when there are no B7 cons to attend, I will return to SF cons. With possibly the occasional reasonably priced driving-distance no-Guest general media con like *MediaWest* for visiting with scattered fan friends and zine shopping. I will be attending GAMBIT and FREEDOM CITY cons this year, and wish I could go to ORAC and the San Diego one; I haven't even considered Houston or Seattle, because I don't care to pay these registration prices (to say nothing of air fare and hotels) to see Guests I'm not interested in, or maybe never even heard of. This year's SCORPIO was my first and probably also my last, even though I live literally about 5 miles away and could commute. But that $45 registration would also pay for a goodly chunk of a plane ticket to an all B7 con - and it will!

I would, incidentally, be very happy to see a no-Guest B7 con, I've been saying that for years. It's mainly the *series* and the *characters* that appeal to me, I can live without seeing the actors. Besides, if I want to see, for example, Paul Darrow - I have him in a little black box on my closet shelf. All I have to do is take it out, plop it in my VCR, push a button and there he is. When I'm tired of him, I push another button and he goes away. And if I ever got really, REALLY tired of him, I could push a couple of other buttons and he'd go away permanently... an ideal arrangement, now that I think of it.

JAN CHAPPELL London ENGLAND

I read with increasing disgust the latest "Lost Seska" zine. How sad that sections of the B7 fandom and the running of conventions, born out of enthusiasm for the program, should obviously be turning sour, apprently corrupted by power struggles and with fear guests have been corrupted by power and greed. It is such a disappointment.

At this point I felt moved to say for my part how much I have enjoyed the generosity and kidness of British and American fandom. However, I have also worked hard. Remember, as a guest, as soon as you leave your private hotel robm, you are in "public". You are aware of being observed all the time, demands being made and for some people this may be easier than for others depending on your personality. It is fun but is is very tiring. A visit to a Con, albeit an American one, is not a holiday (Space City Con report), it is enjoyable hard work. A con can be a novelty once or twice, but as you can imagine, for guests who are invited frequently and accepted, it might possibly begin to feel like non-stop hard work, so don't be too hard. When guests cross the Atlantic becuase they are available they always run the risk of missing that all-important job interview. So don't be too hard on your guests.

Our reward is your shows of enthusiasm, continuing interests, sweet gifts, cards and friends. I know we are all aware of what we owe you. God bless. Peace and thank you.

GAIL BENNETT Miramar FL

The FA's letters about the proposed "pro" B7 cons was very interesting, from several points of view. Primarily I agree with your attitude about pro cons - what they've done to DW fandom has been discouraging, to say the least. But I take exception to the tone of these letters, which seem to heap so much of the blame on the guests who are asking for fees. I also object to an anonymous letter accusing not-so-anonymous people of a conspiracy. Regardless of whether you believe your source to be "unimpeachable", and therefore perhaps deserving of "protection", in this country the accused have the right to confront their accusers. Did you ask any of those accused their versions of the story? *(Yes. ed)* Before you liken someone else's tactics to those of the Federation, how about remembering that in the real world someone is presumed innocent until proven guilty. If everything you've printed is true, then yes, we have a right to be upset. HOWEVER:

These people likewise have every right to expect payment for their appearances. What they are doing when they come here for a convention is WORKING - I don't care what labels you put on it. The fact that so many of the stars of DW, B7, et al, have attended cons for mere expenses in the past (and present, in many cases) has been a gift to the fans - who have become extremely spoiled by that.

That's not to say I agree with promoters like Rubenstein and Elder lining their pockets with ripoff events - they didn't invent the process, however, and free enterprise IS permitted in this country; nodoby is taking the fans' money at gunpoint. In the end, everybody loses, the promoters included, for all thereasons and in all the ways you stated. But no one should be vilified for trying to make a buck. You want to be paid for your photography and I for my artwork; why shouldn't Paul Darrow or Jon Pertwee or whoever want something back for their time and talent, and the promoter for providing the venue? They - like we do - put a price on it. It either sells or it doesn't. If someone can't afford $5000 to bring a guest over for a con, they'll either book a different guest or no guest - a con can be as much fun with straight fannish programming, as you pointed out.

As for Paul Darrow's earlier statements that he would not charge for appearances: aside from the fact that anyone is entitled to a change of mind, understand that he and other B7 & DW personalities are coming over here and seeing incredible amounts of money changing hand at conventions - nevermind who ends up with it, it's a hell of a lot more money than anyone on the far side of the Atlantic would see floating around on a daily basis. They see people going home with armloads of fanzines at $10 and $20 a pop, briefcases full of photos - and the prices fetched at auction by some pieces of artwork are staggering (remember the pencil drawing of Vila that went for $600 at SCORPIO two years ago?)! If they are thinking "Why can't some of that cash be spent on me?", who could blame them, and since when do we have the right, in the most capitalistic country on the planet, to say no??

To reitrerate, I understand and support your contempt of cons which are only out for the fans' bread, and for "blacklisting", if indeed that is to become part of the game. (Info gleaned "from someone who talked to the man" tends to be suspect. I don't care if your source was the Pope).

As for the "stable" system you mentioned, that is scarcely different from unionization, which is quite common on both sides of the Atlantic. *Maybe you've* forgotten that said system was discussed amongst the DW guests *once upon a time*, to protect them from exploitation by the con promoters. At that time, you supported the idea (as many of us did), and in fact were furious with the one individual who "crossed the line" and made his own deal. Who was being greedy, and who was just trying to get fair pay for his time? These people do not "owe" the fans their sweat and blood for free. Adulation is great, but tell me the name of one DW or B7 actor who landed a major film role or TV series in America or sold a fortune on books or merchandise over here based on fannish attention. Hero worship neither buys groceries nor pays the mortgage or kids' college tuition.

On the "control" of artists and writers, and that 50% commission business: there's not an artist or writer I know who will go along with that, and they must know it if they have contemplated such a thing, so why worry? I've gathered that the one thing that concerns the personalities most is the "slash" material in circulation, and why shouldn't it? You know and I know and the average fan knows that the character and the actor are not the same person - but on a deeper level there is not one of us who isn't subject to some distortion of reality in that area. If those who produce slash material are so adament as to its value, why hide behind pseudonyms? And why be so surprised and hurt when the actor finds out where the stuff is coming from and gets upset about it?

Most importantly, why would you WANT to do something you know is disturbing to these people, if you care so much about them?

You said you could no longer stand by in silence, but neither can I. Your indignation is too loud to ignore. The fans have been exploited, but so have the "stars", and as close as you've been to some of them at cons you should know that. I remember Jackie Pearce fainting at SCORPIO, and Paul pushing himself in Newark despite an injured back. How about Colin Baker and JNT signing four hours of autographs in Vally Forge - and who could ever forget "PosterCon"?

Or Patrick Troughton.

The natural course of supply and demand will stabilize prices. Crusading isn't necessary. And in case you think the prices you quoted me are high, try getting an American actor to a con sometime. $10,000 was a minimum fee quoted me by an actress who has fifth billing on her TV series. And she GETS it - for a four-hour appearance, not a three-day marathon.

And we want the Brits to keep doing it for free...?

One more comment as the risk of ending up on your permanent shit list: you had said in a note accompanying your original letter that you didn't plan on printing all this in the FA in order to keep the newsletter out of the political garbage pit, then you promptly backtracked on that. Maybe you felt it was your duty to involve the average fans incontroversy whether they want it or not. The separate letter got the point across just as well, without blemishing the FA's enjoyable format. I happen to enjoy the FA, as do many people - but it's your baby if you chose to drown it.

With respect for your opinions and hope for equal respect of mine.

The only thing I was ever told about the "unionization" of the DW actors, was from Colin himself and that it was a "boycott" by "all the Doctors" and for MORE money and or some kind of "retainer" to be paid to them for having to refuse other work in order to remain available to Spirit Of Light.

At that time, I was FOR anything that was AGAINST S.O.L.!

In the case of the autograph session at Valley Forge, and "PosterCon" - they were being paid, as I've been led to believe, fairly substantial fees to do so. In the multi thousands of dollars, plus expenses. Or so I was told by Colin, et al. After all, the Spirit of Light Mega Cons and Tours were "Pro" cons, put on for money and to sell merchandise.

As far as I'm concerned, it's nobody's business why I read or write slash fiction. But given the current "witch hunt", fans "turning in" fellow fans to the Darrows, and the general homophobia, it's little wonder most of the slash writers take pseuds.

The emotions I went through after reading the first two pages of the last FA were incredible. My gut reaction was that I wanted nothing to do with the fandom ever again. Then I wanted to rally the troops, gather all the ammo I could, fly to England and kick every actor I could find right in the tush. The feeling of betrayal was worst I think. But now that I've had a chance to calm down, I've started thinking about just what it is in the fandom that I enjoy so much. And I remembered SCORPIO.

I got my membership to SCORPIO VI about a year ago when all the guests were still planning to attend, and I was very happy. Then, with each update they sent me, more and more guest names were dropped from the list. I was becoming unhappy. When I finally arrived in Chicago for my very first SCORPIO I found out that not a single B7 actor would be in attendance. I was pissed. How on earth could you have a B7 con with no B7 guests? What would we do? Well, I found out in a hurry. SCORPIO is a remarkable con. It was the first fan con I had ever gone to. Wow! Folks, the main guests of last SCORPIO were not Terry Nation and friends. They were the FANS! I met so many wonderful people at SCORPIO, and later at TARDISCON, many of whom I'm still in touch with. And I firmly believe that even without a single actor in attendance EVER AGAIN SCORPIO and its counterparts will thrive. It's the FANS who make this FANDOM work, not *** (fill on the blank). And as an aside, I hope SCORPIO will continue to highlight British Media, not just B7. You learn a lot that way. Oh, and incidentally, I found out about SCORPIO from a pro con called STARCON. So even though I truly dislike pro cons, they do have a certain usefullness.

SUE ANN SARICK Orchard Park NY

After having read your editorial in the Dec/Jan issue of the FA I was both dismayed and saddened at the turn of events in B7 conventions. You know what struck me as really being funny and ironic is that the actors who think they are such big "stars" aren't even known by most of the population of the United States!

And after reading the review on ANGLICON a few months back, I realized that I was really stiffed at the tiny little con I attended a few years back. Jon Pertwee was the main guest and he was ushered in and out of the room by Gail Bennett as if 200 fans were goong to mob this elder gentleman! I mean really, some big movie star or rock star I could see a need for such precautions but for Mr. Pertwee and with such a small gathering! (*Escorting Jon was probably Gail's job. This is often done at Media cons with a "big" Guest. Simple security, so don't knock Gail. I've done it myself. ed*).

It all started making no sense to me. They also told us that if we wanted an autograph from him that we had to keep the line moving and that we were forbidden to talk to him! I'd never been to a convention before so I had nothing to compare it to. So I guess I haven't been missing all that much where conventions are concerned. Especially when actors who appear to be genuine friends of the fans and filled with gratitude that they suddenly should turn on you! It seems that greed and selfishness is an attitude that is also running rampant through this country as well! I can only suppose that this action is motivated by envying the actors in Hollywood. But what they don't realize is that it seems these actors can only demand top dollar for their movie appearances for a short time in their career.

You know what all this negative talk reminds me of? There was a passage in Agatha Christie's autobiography in which she said her aunt always said to think the worst of people, then you won't be disappointed. And these words of wisdom came decades ago during Agatha's childhood! I guess people will always be the same, with or without progress. So I guess all one can do is to fall in love with the series and the storylines and try to be objective where the actors are concerned. Instead get involved with the characters and forget about idolizing the performers. Maybe British actors are getting cynical and abrasive towards the public because jobs are usually hard to find in Great Britain in the acting profession.

So, in closing all I can say is we just might have to be satisfied in sharing our stories, art and poetry and our visions of BLAKES 7 only amongst each other.

I guess if we didn't have some bad times in our lives, we wouldn't be capable of enjoying, celebrating and recognizing the good times!

LEIGH ARNOLD Van Nuys CA

A Statement on the State of BLAKES SEVEN Fandom

Recently, I was sent two pieces of interesting literature, both saying nearly the same thing. I will address the first since the second (where the writer has not the courage to sign her name) was so licentious and full of emotionalism and sensationalism that it does not warrant a serious answer. The first, however, provoked me with several concepts with which I have a problem.

The letter seemed to indicate that all the problems we may be experiencing in B7 fandom are caused by the actors themselves. It suggested that if the actors ignore the advice of certain prominent fans (Big Name Fans, or BNFs, in fandom jargon), then B7 will be ruined. It suggested that the actors are insisting they actually be PAID for their appearance! - and paid well, or they'll take themselves elsewhere to "approved" Cons. It suggested that if they take this attitude, we don't need them. It suggested that we might even look outside B7 for future guests for fan cons, presumably because other guests would be more agreeable to put up free appearances. It sugested that if this trend continued, there would be some conflict between the actors and the BNFs, and we'd be better off lising the actors.

Since I have strong feelings about B7 fandom, the actors and my fellow fans, and since I'm one of the early warriors (who suffered the camera copies, getting stuff from England, and had trouble connecting with the far and few between other fans), I feel qualified to voice my sentiments about this subject.

Cons and Big Name Fans

I was in a position to see the inner workings of cons a few years ago, and got to see a lot of the dirt and the slime in the "inner circle" of these things. I saw simple and friendly fans in *Doctor Who* become arrogrant Names. One woman in DW fandom with whom I had corresponded for two years, trading tapes, and even staying over at her house, couldn't so much as say "hello" when she was one of the committee responsible for putting on one of the first DW cons. By the time I saw this happen in B7 fandom, I figured that this was just a natural evolution. Because of my exposure to cons, and seeing what happened to committee members in DW, I was not surprised when certain members of what we called East Coast Establishment started acting as if they had invented B7 fandom, and that the actors were their private property. (To this day, they give themselves credit for being the pioneers of B7 fandom. However, it is a documented fact that there was a B7 fan organization here in Los Angeles as early as 1980. Given the number of expatriate Britons living here because of the film industry, it is no wonder. There were also fans in Oregon, Iowa, Texas and Florida, as early as the late 70's. And we knew each other, so there was already a "network".)

Correspondence in the past couple years from certain BNFs to me astonished me with their cavalier attitude towards the actors, notably Paul Darrow and Michael Keating. From these BNFs themselves I learned that Paul Darrow was their private possession, and that Michael was to be treated like a pet. Worse than a pet, because I give my sheltie Justin more credit for intelligence than they give Michael! Outrageous? You bet!

At some of the cons in recent years, Paul and Michael have nearly been asphyxiated by a small group of fans (usually the con-cons and their BNF friends) who do not let them go anywhere, do anything, or meet any new fans without these few BNFs standing [illegible] 1991, but I've heard this from many sources, including Paul Darrow. Four years ago SCORPIO con-cons was already behaving in this manner!). Michael, being sweeter and more agreeable by nature, has a bit harder time, and has recently suffered being commanded to make appearances at some cons.

Making Money

As to the objection that they make money at cons - why not? What are they supposed to do, drop everything to come runing at our beck and call, forget mortgage payments, groceries, utility bills and taxes just because we demand their presence? They did SCORPIO II for free for the novelty of it - because it was astonishing to them there there were so many people in the States who were fans of a show they had never really seen (we showed Michael one of the camera copy episodes we had - and he kept telling me he couldn't believe we sat down and watched that!). Neither he, Paul nor Brian Croucher (he and Terry Nation were the other guests) had been in the States beforek and money was raised for their airfare. What a lark! They are such gentlemen that they decided early on that fans would come first whenever possible, and hence we've had a lot of cheap cons at which to meet them. We are lucky to be fans of a show where the stars are so accessible and so nice to their fans. They put us first, and we should put them first. Some BNFs put BNFs first, and that's my trouble with this fandom.

Paul has just finished a (cheap) paid tour for CREATIONS Cons. Being paid even this much for these cons enabled him to stay away from earning money back home for awhile longer, and he was able to stop off to visit his Southern California fans who would not otherwise get to meet him. We were charged $5 a person to attend this small "con" in San Diego which charge in all probability barely paid for the hotel and refreshments. Yet I am told he is a money-monger and will only do cons to line his pockets. Uh huh, right.

Both statements I received were written by persons appalled by the idea that the actors should receive any money for their con apperances. Yet they think it is fair that only FANS make money! And they do make money. Some fans make money off zines (and I'll not quibble over zine prices!). Some make money off of art auctions. And I have no problem with that. Some of the work (art in particular) is so good and so much effort has been put into it that the artist deserves compensation. But - that's Paul's and Michael's and Gareth's faces they're using. The actors get no money from the fan work. They get nada for any fan activity. In the real world, any use of Terry's characters, or Paul's likeness (portrait and caricature) for example, would require royalties being paid to these gentlemen. All they ask is that they get paid a fee - which "no touch" stars such as William Shatner get for much less work. What is wrong with that? Why are fans allowed to line their pockets, but the people who CREATED the subject of the fandom are not so allowed? I don't believe in double standards. Terry and the actors have as much right - more so, in fact - to any money going around than any of we fans.

Other Guests At Cons

Los Angeles is the second largest city in the country. In the Greater Los Angeles area there are 8,000,000 people. We have a lot of actors and stars living here. We put on a lot of cons. I don't attend them. Why? Because my media interest is BLAKES SEVEN. Limited and narrow, perhaps, but I have enough other interests that this one media overfills my time just nicely, thank you. I certainly wouldn't go the distance to a non-B7 con if B7 were only a small part of it. If Paul Darrow doesn't want to share the limelight with actors from other television shows, I don't blame him. I'm not interested in seeing them myself. Dilute a B7 con with something else and you dilute my interest.

I am not "star struck" and I don't hero-worship. *Few Angelenos do that. Meeting* other fans at a con is as much a draw for me as the guests. *I agree with the* statement that fans are important. True, we would not be a fandom without fans. We can, however, do without Big Name Fans, as that term has come to mean. (The new definition is a fan who thinks they are more important than anyone else, including the actors, of this fandom. While the BNFs acknowledge their title and its definition as applied to themselves, they also use a double standard and think the new definition applies only to their fellow BNFs with whom they've had a political falling out, and they apply this "double-think" to many things, this current controversy in particular). But this fandom would NOT stand alone with just the fans.

A lot of fictitious characters fire the imagination. Jim DiGris, Steve Carella and the 87th, Frodo, Jherek Carnelian, Count Francesco Ragoczy Saint Germain are all fascinating characteers. (No offense, Linda, for the following comparison, but as it's Paul Darrow who's mostly under attack by the statements, I'll use his character as an example. It certainly applies to Blake as well.) Kerr Avon would also have been a fascinating literary character, and a lot of people could have played the part well. (I can see Rowan Atkinson doing it!) But it is Paul Darrow who's given Avon the look, sound and mannersims that have captured our hearts. if Rowaan Atkinson had played Avon, for example, I would have liked the show tremendously. I would make sure I had seen them all, and were I home, I would cetainly watch it. Because it was Paul Darrow's Avon, however, I tracked down camera copies all over the world that were so faded, strobey and glitchy they were barely worth watching. And when Lionheart brought B7 to the States, I spent a lot of effort to replace those cameras with increasingly superior copies. Because it is Paul Darrow's Avon, I have written reams of paper based on his character (19 zines, 92 stories). I have collected art and photos. I have collected other videos in which he and Miahcel Keating appear, colledted books, magazines, fanzines, calendars, toys and other merchandise - yes, I most certainly am a fan! My other favorite B7 character is Vila, and again, the same is true of Michael Keating. It is HIS Vila that attracts.

So I cannot be told that the fandom does not require the actors. I consider it a bonus that the two men that I adore on television, in fanzines, and in my art collection, would be such patient, accommodating, friendly and genuinely nice human beings as well.

However, Paul is NOT Avon; Michael is NOT Vila; Gareth is NOT Blake, etc., etc.; and many fans treat them as such, which may be why, in part, some certain BNFs treat Michael like a "moron". They have lives outside a televisions series that stopped being filmed eight years ago. I think it is outrageous that any fan suggest that they be at OUR disposal, to go where we demand, do what we demand, when we demand - and for free or for very little money! Yes, it would be a hard ship on us should we have to pay more than we do to see them, or if only professional cons could afford them instead of any fan group who wanted to put on a con. But they are not our property!

If they are going to take time off from earning a living, then they should be given a good reason for doing so. Early cons were that reason because of the novelty of it. A few cons (i.e., recently in San Diego) are still worth it to them because it IS fun. But why should they go to a fan-run con if they are going to be thrown into the middle of fandom politics (which they have), yanked back and forth by rival fans, fought over, treated like house pets or naughty children and ordered about - for free or for little money? Would you put up with that?**

Pro Vs Fan Cons

What's wrong with a pro con? Fans don't get the money and you don't get to see the actors, are the charges. When some BNFs monopolize the actors, the same is true: fans don't get to meet them. I've been told by some BNFs how they've cleaned up at cons, and obviously they are afraid of losing their position, power and own pocketbook if they are not the ones doing them. Besides, looking father than one's

the same people. Pro cons, however, attract a wider diversity of membership, and could expose the charms of the actors and the fantastic uniqueness of the series to a whole new wave of fans. BNFs, and cons run by them, (ie, not all cons), keep the series on a closed circuit.

In Summation

The actors are not causing any problem in B7 fandom. They are a victim of it, as are we small name fans. Possessiveness and rivalry (and resisting a new Doctor, of all things!) by a small number of Big Name Fans is what destroyed Doctor Who fandom for the most part in the United States, not the actors. It, not the actors, could destroy B7 fandom as well.

Finally, I personally believe the statements I received were generated by some disgruntled Big Name Fans who are discovering they can't push people - the actors and the rank-and-file fans - around. If it came down to it, as the statements suggested, between the actors and the BNFs, I could well do without the latter. This thing created by Terry Nation, Paul Darrow and Michael Keating has enriched my life enormously. It has been enhanced fantastically by all the rank-and-file fans I've met (and continue to meet) with whom I've become (sometimes close) friends. The BNFs have contributed nothing but recognition of their own names.

The statement I received finished with the line that there were fans before and will be after, the actors. I disagree. I say the actors, like the rank-and-file fans, are an integral part of this fandom. Big Name Fans are not.

And to paraphrase the statement, I was here before the BNFs, and I'll be here after. I should hope that the actors and the rank-and-file fans will be there too.

Gosh, and all this time, I thought I was giving the rank-and-file fans an open forum. You see, I'm an "isolated" SESKA too. B7 isn't on in this part of Florida, so no fellow fans to hang out with.

Read My Lips: I never said actors should do cons for "free". Only that I find some fees unreasonable to ask of a Fan Run Con.

Paul and Michael are never thre only Media Guest at a CREATIONS. They have always shared the Con with TREK guests. Paul and Michael alone would not draw the thousand and more Malin needs to feed his Cons.

I can't say what other "fans" earn at Cons, but by the time I pay an agenting fee, a percentage to SIDS and Animal Welfare, 40 cents each for the photos which I sell for $1, I make a grand total of 25 cents a photo (which photos I sell with permission from the actors and their "share" goes to the charities in their names). This rarely pays for my hotel room.

and I wrote a similar "warning" to the Liberator Atlanta newsletter - and I was accused of "attacting" Paul - by Janet!

It was not any "fans" that nearly destroyed DW fandom, it was ENTREPENEURS, who sought to "control" the guests and the fandom.

JANE CARNALL Edinburgh SCOTLAND

The Pro/Fan controversy; right. Fandom is about fans and fun and friends and freedom. Anyone (BNF;BNW;BNA) who thinks that they are Big Name enough to control fandom is riding for a very nasty fall, sooner or later; in the case of the actor in question (controlling *zines*???), I sincerely hope it's sooner. Further than that, as a Scottish fan, I'm beginning to think I shouldn't say, except that's English fans, not Scots, who get to see the actors so often. *Are You Lonesome Tonight?* was the first-ever time any B7 actor has ever played in Edinburgh. Scottish cons are kind of thin on the ground as well.

BRENDAN SEAN O'CULLANE Chicago IL

First off, I have spent the better part (worst part?) of the past two months hearing about this flap about the proposed "pro" cons. I keep hoping that it will just blow over, but it just seems to be getting worse. I'dlike to know something about the other side to this debate ... has anyone first hand and in the know replied to these rumors? Namely the actor involved (*his letter will end this addendum. ed*)? If so, will you print the reply? I think it's time for the B7 fandom to do some reality checking, folks. This is a fandom, isn't it? Doesn't that mean we're here to have a good time? Why all this grief? So a "pro" tour happens, maybe it doesn't so what? Yes, you are right to let everyone know what is going on, that is what a letterzine is for - distributing information, but we need some perspective on this whole thing. For those of us who were planning fan cons and hoping to have guests at them (I was part of the group planning a B7 cruise - that idea has since bit the dust because of this business) it was a rather devastating blow to the plans, but really, life will go on. We have to start remembering what unites us rather than playing political devisive games. Being a midwesterner, I feel rather caught in the middle between the east coast and west coast factions, and I know people in both, so that makes it awkward, to say the least. We all need to be a little more forgiving of our fellow fen, and move on to holding this fandom together. It is going through one hell of a strain right now. I'd hate to see it die.

DOTTY BARRY Claremont CA

Since I was not there, I cannot speak to the issue of truth in the accusations recently made against Paul Darrow. However, as a veteran of many fandoms, I can honestly say that no actor in any of those fandoms has willingly spent as much time and genuine interest on the rank-and-file fans as Mr. Darrow. I will not be persuaded against my own experience and observations by the Geraldo-School-of-Journalism manipulation employed by this "anonymous" fan.

Be it known that as an adult many, many years past the age of consent, I do not require, rather quite resent, unasked for "protection" from unscrupulous persons. I am more than capable of making my own judgements and arriving at my own conclusions as to who are the unscrupulous and who are the power-hungry.

Furthermore, I consider accusations based on hearsay and made under the cloak of anonymity to be suspect at best. More than that, such actions are dishonorable. Did anyone bother to speak with Mr. Darrow concerning the alleged incidents reported in the FA *before* said hearsay was distributed throughout fandom as fact? (*yes. ed*) Who heard Mr. Darrow say what, when, where, under what circumstances? In what context were these statements made? To whom were thee statements directed? Was the "reporter" a participant in this conversations, or was the conversation overheard? The basis of our rights under the law begins with the right of the accused to be faced by his accusors, be he American or British.

Names, dates, times, places - just some simple facts, please. Sensationalist tactics and histronics do not take the place of truth. If B7 fandom is destined for civil war, let us at least be armed with more than conflicting rumors.

Linda - during the two-and-a-half decades in which I have been involved in several fandoms, such power struggles have unfortunately appeared with nauseating regularity. Most frequently unfounded rumor and its enthusiastic proponents have been the cause of the bloodletting. At times the damage has been too great to heal, and no one remains to care who was right or wrong. I would hate to see this happen to B7 fandom. As you yourself said in a previous FA, "Blake's Seven is special." This does not have to be another Dr. Who fiasco.

Lastly, what can be the benefit in diluting B7 cons with guests from other genres? Media cons exist in abundance. Anglophile I may be, but personally, I would not be willing to pay more money to see Jeremy Brett, Rowan Atkinson, or any other "names" simply because they are "known beyond B7".

[illegible] hefty fees for FAN RUN cons, then the cons might as well cut out the fan people who have not been seen before in fandom. *Just an observation.*

Well, this gives those "unscrupulous fans" an opportunity to put up or shut up: how about some names, places, dates? Who said what to whom?

Most of what has been alleged to have been said came from [redacted] people who heard the same things said to them in different places at different times.

So - put out a "statement" you lot. What did he say to each of you and where and when? Paul is attacking Annie, what do the rest of you have to say?

JILL GRUNDFEST Richfield Springs NY

It has been two and a half years since B7 entered my life and added so much to it. I met Paul Darrow for the first time after watching three episodes. There is no way I would have started writing stories (some 20 published) if I hadn't met Paul - if his handsomness and niceness and intelligence and politeness and humor had not so fascinatingly added to the interest I was developing in Avon.

I have never been so infolved in a fandom, though I was a devout watcher of the original STAR TREK and have enjoyeed many television programs. Part of it is the quality of B7 fans - *their* niceness and intelligence and humor, by and large - but I still get a great kick out of watching and listening to Paul. Not to slight the other actors, many of whom I have met, now. But Paul is still my focus. He is still the main reason I attend B7 cons.

That is why I am really disturbed to hear of a campaign that seems designed to make him out a villian. That also seems designed to make *him* disenchanted with *us*, the fans. I owe all those who created B7, but especially Paul, far too much (in friendships made, stories created, and sheer fun enjoyed) to simply let the attacks go by.

Paul's and Terry Nation's proposed "pro con" tour, as described by them, sounds like a blast. I have no problem with the actors wanting to be paid for attending cons. Paul's explanation, that their being paid a fee will make it much more certain that they will appear at the con they are scheduled for, as any other "professional commitment," makes sense. It certainly is no reason for vilifying him. Most of the Dr. Who actors I enjoy and admire, in character and in person, won't attend a con without a (hefty) fee, *and never have*. Paul and other B7 actors, notably Micheal Keating, have gone out of their way, and hither and yon, for years, without a fee, *just because we wanted them to. They* got a kick out of meeting *us*. And of course they enjoy being lionized; who wouldn't? The Dr. Who actors (to name names, Jon Pertwee and the late and deservedly beloved Patrick Troughton) also enjoyed the admiration, but in their view they were being invited as actors and actors work to get paid. And going to a con, let us not forget, *is* work, even if you are only forced to stand up and be charming constantly. Some amateur (i.e. nonprofit) cons like I-Con At Stony Brook, have been paying actors to be their guests for years. It is the actors' choice to say yes or no to a con commitment, for whatever reason they choose. We don't own these people.

Why the hysteria currently spreading among fan clubs and individual fans, like a disease? We are reacting with alarm, and a, to me, inexplicable mistrust, to a series of lies launched by a few power-hungry fans who have alienated Paul and Michael by their attitudes and behavior and are afraid of losing control. This hysteria, taking the form of outcries against Paul Darrow, is dividing the fandom. It is terribly destructive to the atmosphere of mutual affection and fun that is the best part of fandom. This atmosphere, celebrating friendship and creativity, is so delicate. Like a fantasy, built on air, it can vanish, *leaving only cold emptiness* behind.

Why are we doing this? Sure we can ignore Paul and Michael, ask non-B7 actors to our cons. Why would we? Why have a B7 fandom at all? There is no sensible answer to such a question. But my life, for one, would be greatly bereft if the actors alienated from the fans and the fans from each other, B7 failed.

We got involved with B7 because of our fascination with the characters and their situation. The B7 actors *created* these characters, formed them into what we know. Today, they bring enduring interest to them. They deepen and enrich the fantasy by being such worthwhile people to know, themselves. Many fans do *not* know them, and cannot judge from personal experience - or they do know better and are allowing their judgement to be swayed by people who are so-called "experts in the field". That is a very sad thing. Most of us are intelligent adults. Intelligent adults don't believe everything they hear.

I won't say the B7 actors, especially Paul and Michael, are unique in their approachability. There *are* other nice actors! But it is a rare and unexpected enough quality to be a pleasure. Why spoil the pleasure for ourselves by refusing to acknowledge their right to control their own destinies, control and organize a con tour if they're insane enough to do it (for fun and profit - and charity - and US - and come on, nobody gets rich from producing conventions!) and decide how they want to do it?

The lies dealing with the charity issue particularly disturb me, by the way. They show more clearly than any other the vindictiveness behind the facade of "fan solidarity". I know Paul is a charitable person; at a recent Creaton Con I attended he was selling his own still photographs to benefit an animal charity. I too am a charitable person, when I can afford it; it ticks me off that I am not getting paid enough of a salary so I can afford to give to more charities!

Enough said? Let's not obscure the issue. The issue seems to be a very ugly one, of fans (a *few* fans) wanting to keep their monopoly on these actors, and thus their positions of power in this fandom. Ech. I *hate* politics. "Politics" or in-fighting, or your basic, selfish, do-what-I-want or WE won't do anything, has ruined more fun clubs that I can think of. It always ruins a good time for those of us only interested, innocently, in *having* a good time. Please, please, please, don't let this happen to B7 fandom.

Please let the fantasy continue. For all of us.

Strictly from my "biased" point of view, I find it interesting that when you mention the B7 actors, you always refer to "Paul and Micheal". As if no other actor was on the show or appeared at the Cons.

JEFF MORRIS Webster Groves MO

Around the first or second Saturday in December (I forget which), I received an evening phone call from Lois Indelicato. She informed me that she and Laurie Cohen had been authorized by Paul Darrow and Terry Nation to set up a series of exclusive, professional conventions across the country. The con sites she mentioned were New York, Philadelphia, Florida, Chicago, Houston, Dallas, St. Louis, and San Francisco, with other sites being considered. The idea apparently was that the local fans would run the con in each city, with Laurie and Co. coordinating the effort.

Lois added that Cherry and Nancy from SCORPIO, Laura Virgil from Texas, the con organizers from ORAC and DESTINY, and a few others had been contacted, though she didn't say what their answers had been. She stated that Paul would only appear at these cons and no others in 1989, and that he was guaranteeing himself, Terry and Michael, with Sally Knyvette and Stephen Greif as possible additons. The same exclusivity would apply to them as well.

regarded by him, and asked whether I'd be interested in coordinating the dealers' rooms in these con sites.

Now, a bit of background here would help. I've been in Who fandom since '83 and I remember all too well what Linda mentioned concerning Barb Elder. In addition, at one point the local St. Louis club, the St. Louis CIA, had entered negotiations with Elder about getting Tom Baker for a con to be held in Spring of '84. Elder would provide the guest, the CIA the manpower, and any profits would be split equally.

Well, the CIA couldn't get adequate terms negotiated with Elder, and so declined to hold the con. A second group in the area did accept her terms, and the con was held in March, 1984. Elder apparently split with all the con profits, leaving the other club broke and in the cold.

In addition, I've been serving in various capacities (including president) of the CIA since '84, and recently stepped down from all my duties to get away from the hassles and headaches and to do stuff that I thought sounded like fun. So when Lois made this offer, I remembered the Elder incident immediately and asked her what kind of terms she was offering the other clubs. While she answered (nothing had been decided about percentages of profit or loss liability), I mentally added up how much time and energy it would take to do all the dealer room work (I have run three rooms in the pst five years). I quickly concluded that it wasn't worth the time and energy required - especially since I'd just quit the CIA in order to GET some free time - and declined her offer.

Lois then asked me whether the Rabble Rousers or the CIA might be interested in doing one of the cons. I replied that the two clubs were working on a joint venture for next year (1989), but that I would pass all this along to them and get back to her with their answer. A bit of small talk followed, followed by an amicable parting.

This was, at the time, all I'd heard about the Darrow Tour. I decided to wait a few days and see if anything else came up about it. The information that came about three days later confirmed my decision and reinforced it, if anything. I don't list any of it here because it didn't come to me first-hand from Laurie, Lois, etc.

One thing to remember, too - I have met Paul Darrow the grand total of ONE time, at DSV, for all of five minutes. I was there to get his answer concerning the terms the CIA/Rabble Rousers had offered for his appearance at TARDISCON. I must have made one hell of a good impression, I thought at the time. Later, Celeste Hotaling informed that she had presented our names to Laurie at one of their earlier meetings.

An additional footnote: since, due to my occasional forays into the adult zine world (slash and straight), I figured that if there was indeed going to be an "approved writers" list, I wouldn't be on it. Since I had given Celeste a story (which won "Best Short Story" at SCORPIO) for her zine, and since Celeste was apparently working on the Darrow Tour, I decided it wouldn't be fair to prevent the sale of her zine at these cons just because of my story. So I withdrew the publication rights from her zine and have given them to Annie, figuring we blacklisted writers and editors have to stick together.

What amazes me is that, despite the fact that I can't think of a single reason why anyone would even want to conduct a "Smear Paul" campaign (though some now have sufficient motive and then some), despite the fact that the Darrow Tour organizers claim that these cons are to get the "small name fans" involved and take the "power" away from the "big name fans" (when the "big namers" were the first people they went to for help), and that despite the fact that all these stories have been told by the Tour organizers and Mr. Darrow himself (and are all being denied as having ever been said), that some people are refusing to see the facts and just line up with Paul because he's Paul. The First Church of the Mengat must be increasing in numbers, I guess.

So, in conclusion, I suggest that if the people setting up this convention want to go ahead and do it, I say by all means lets them. If this is what Paul wants, fine. No one has to support this financially or in any other way if he/she doesn't want to. Let them sink or swim on their own. This is the last time I'm going to write about any of this. Life's too short to worry things like this. All these threats of destroying people, splitting up friendsships, and similar garbage are utterly meaningless and pure hyperbole. Don't even give them the barest trace of respectibility.

Don't worry, be happy.

I personally find it curious that one of the organizers behind the Tour, was one of the very "power-hungry BNFs" the "sofs" are railing against.

I too would like to know what the Tour organizers have decided to give to the various people they call upon to put together and run these cons. It is a full-time job that has to be done in spare-time. Will these people get a percentage of the profits the organizers hope to make? Will their expenses from Con to Con be taken care of? They should, for that kind of work. After all, the Tour is designed to make money, why should the actors be the only paid hands? Actors aren't the only ones who "work" at a Con.

Interesting that Annie, who's being so vilified by Paul, et al, was ASKED by Cohen and Co. to run the Dealers' Rooms at these cons after Jeff declined.

Jeff's own experience underscores the "fact" that Paul was quoted as telling people that "his" cons would have him and a few chosen guests, "exclusive" of any other fan con this next year.

LEAH ROSENTHAL Brooklyn NY

What follows is a brief statement of my stand regarding the current controvery in BF fandom. Contrary to what is being said by certain individuals representing the proposed "pro-fancon" (this is how they're identifying it now, folks), I have not "sold out" Ann Worthan, nor do I disagree in any fashion with the statements made in her public letter in the FEDERATION ARCHIVES.

The reason why the organizers and the "star" of these proposed conventions are attaching Ms. Worthan is because she gave them a focus for their embarrassment at being caught out in their intention to a) put an end to any convention relating to BF, fan-fun or otherwise, that is not under their complete control and b) make certain that maximum profit derived from American fans (of ANY size name) shall be directed toward their sole benefit and prestige. With the publication of her letter, Ann Worthan became the first fan with the courage to put her outrage in print ... outrage at what was going to happen (*I sent out at least 50 or more private articles of my own before that. ed*). Her reward for this has been a rather graceless and vicious series of attacks by the people involved in organizing the proposed convention tour.

This is sort of shooting the messenger for bringing the unpleasant facts, wouldn't you say? As to whether the statements quoted by Ann were, indeed, "facts", I will bear witness that I heard the people to whom the actor and his representatives directed these intentions (in their original forms) relate them to me, long before Ann printed her letter. The sources were not one or two disgruntled fans, dear readers. They were people (fannish or *otherwise*) who heard the actor and his representatives make these statements during the recent tour across the United States, this past Autumn. They also had the terms proposed to them individually, in cities across the U.S., by representatives of the organizers, who were attempting to recruit them to run these conventions for them.

that local fan clubs and fans active in BF run these conventions for the organizers, without any mention of payment for their effort, remuneration for any expenses they might incur, or offering of support for the fans or the fandom. The 50% commission on artwork taken on an "approved stable" of artists was stated. So were the comments about "approved fanzines only" and the stated intent to "put the other fan conventions out of business." We NEVER took any issue with the actor's intent to generate revenue for himself - only the totalitarian manner in which this "tour" was to be accomplished. Control of revenue, control of creative effort, control of fandom. Control, control, control. I don't know about the rest of you, but this stinks. I don't wonder that the convention organizers are now frantically scattering long, tedious letters of denial and retraction of their original policy with regard to the con tour. Denying it doesn't erase the reality of the original comments.

Once again, contrary to the incredible rumor among many now being put forth by the understandibly disgruntled organizers of this "pro-fancon" venture, I support the authenticity of the statements made by Ann Worthan in her public letter, agree with her completely on her intention to protect the uninformed fans, and furthermore, I think that the actor's attempts to bully and blacklist Ann Worthan are not worthy of him, nor are they particularly good common sense, good manners or constructive toward fandom, his own career or any respect he may have gathered in his previous appearances in this country.

One little aside here: a certain small group of fans on the West Coast who are voicing opinions of support for the organizers and the actor in this matter are the very same fans who were caught out at "bootlegging" fanzines (or in support of the bootlegging venture) last year. It doesn't take a genius to figure out why they might take this opportunity to raise a banner against Ann Worthan, since she cost them quite a bit of ill-gotten gain (and saved several fanzine publishers from major financial difficulty repaying their printers, or else having to cancel any further issues of their zines). And yes, she also protected her own hard work. How *dare* she?

Finally, if anyone has any doubt as to the veracity of the statements in Ann Worthan's letter, you can check them with me as well. Lay off the messenger, folks - the "Emperor really does have no clothes on this one, and neither does the BIG NAME FAN he is working this convention for (if one does, indeed, define a "BNF" as someone who seeks to selfishly retain the attention of actors all to herself; seeks to regulate and control fanzines, artwork and the proceeds and benefits of same; and simply MUST be at the head of any convention in a position of power, profit and prestige). Work? Why, that sort of thing is for the little people, those "SNF's" who make it all feasible. And one does not offer such fen pay, or thanks, or even credibility. One simply uses them. If they rebel - well then, one just threatens to "destroy them in fandom". How is this accomplished? Well first, you run,crying, to Mister Actor and tearfully tell him about this Terrible Woman who is ruining everything...

You get the idea.

When did "BNF" become a perjorative? It's an old and honored term in 60 years of Fandom. BIG NAME FAN has always designated those who WORKED FOR the fandom; put out the newsletters, the zines, organized the Cons, brought fans together, disseminated information. They DID FOR the fans.

I've always considered myself a SNOF, actually. But now, despite the fact that I've been to a grand total of FOUR cons since 1986 that had Paul as a Guest, kept myself at arm's length from him, as he did from me; gave the fans an Open Forum for discussing the show and characters - as early as 1985 - I am now tossed in with that perjorative generality: "BNF".

I'm very curious to know just what "power plays" I've been responsible for. What have I done to impede any fan in this fandom? What whisper/innuendo campaigns have I gone on? Where and when have I prevented anyone from getting close to Paul, et al?

Annie and I were in no way "alienated" from Paul because we saw ourselves "losing power". Paul became alienated AFTER we published our letters.

Janet was halfway there because some snitch (but their "dear friend") gave away names of slash writers. When I wouldn't rat on fellow writers nor "confess" my "crimes", I was crossed off the Darrow Christmas Card List.

Yet some have had the gall to tell me I'M numbered among the "emotionally unstable" in fandom!

LOIS MAHSAM Milford MA

I've been in fandom a long time, more or less involved for 18 years. Right now, I'm farther from FIWOL (Fandom is a Way of Life), and closer to FIJAGDH (Fandom is Just a God Damn Hobby). In addition to reading SF for over 30 years, I am definitely a media fan and proud of it.

I attend 2 to 6 Cons a year, depending of the year, the finances, and the locations. I enjoy literary-oriented cons and media-oriented cons. I will never miss a MediaWestCon as long as Lori and Gordon are willing to do them.

I've worked levels from gopher to Con Com in many diverse areas. Sometimes I don't work at all. I just go for fun.

So much for my credentials.

I've watched the growing bruhaha in BF fandom with interest, but not much personal involvement, except for the fact that a few good friends are under attack. Fan feuds can be mean. I know. I've been on the receiving end a few times. I stood by one friend, when she was savaged. However, I've never before seen a professional in any area attack fans over fandom.

I am uneasy about actor-oriented cons, whether fan-run or professionally-run. In all these years, I have attended only 4 actor-oriented cons.

I find listening to an audience asking actors questions about roles they portrayed 5, 10, 20 years earlier, unbelievably dull. Programming that is largly photo and autograph sessions is mind-rotting boring.

I have always found particularly abhorrent, the infamous asterick, next to the invited guests on actor-oriented con flyers. The one that leads to the statement at the bottom, saying "professional engagements permitting".

When I go to a con, I expect the guests to be there. And barring illness o major catastrophe, they are there - writers, artists, editors, publishers, BNFs.

Most of all, I feel that the concept of paying actors to attend is truly outrageous. They are wined and dined and gifted and adored. And on top of that, they get money! Not just expenses, but you must pay them too! How desparate can you be?

That one concept of paying a guest, separates actor-oriented cons (pro or fan - it makes no difference) from every other aspect fandom, because at no other fannish cons of any kind are guests paid.

To me it has the distinctly creepy-crawly feeling of paying someone to love you. Or, at least, to say they do.For the weekend, anyway. Until you ante up some more money the next time. And they sure as hell don't respect you in the morning.

This, of course, did not start with the BF actors. This includes professional events with actors from STAR TREK, STAR WARS, and DOCTOR WHO. I will always have a fondness for the old STAR TREK. I consider the STAR WARS saga one of the most significant chapters in cinema. But I won't do to any con-type activity that pays actors to attend. It's no longer a fannish activity, but a professional show. I'm not interested in this particular kind of performance.

And this business about having to break a promise to attend due to work doesn't wash. If you really don't want to go, say so at the beginning.

"A job came up and I can't come". Really. Don't talk to me about bad schedules. I'm a registered nurse in an acute care hospital. I've worked all shifts, rotating shifts, all holidays, weekends, doubles - you name it. I wrote the book on horrible schedules. *(And I edited it! ed).*

Guests are invited a year or more ahead of time. That allows for planning. A few days off for a con can always be worked into a contract, if the person really wants it. It's not done 99% of the time, because it's just not important to the actor.

If the actor gets another role, the con goes out the window. After all, the fantasy or science fiction role was just one small part of the actor's career, and they usually don't know or care about the field. (Mark Hamill was one exception, I believe, being a SF fan before he portrayed Luke Skywalker). They care about acting. They care about their bread-and-butter. They care about applause.

Isaac Asimov and Andre Norton go to cons because they love Science Fiction, and they enjoy their creations it it. Michael Whelan, perhaps the best known SF artist at present, goes for the same reasons. Yes, they like the applause too (of course, the ego-boo is pleasant), but the creation of the work is its own reason for being.

These people, and many like them, do not charge fees for attending cons. Yes, some business is done at some cons - contracts are discussed, projects are firmed, etc. However, mostly they go for many of the same reasons we all have - to socialize with old friends, and perhaps meet new ones; to get feedback on their work; to have a chance to get on a podium or panel and sound off on favorite issues; to browse in the dealers' room and art show; to discuss elements of SF into the wee hours; to party!

Asimov, Norton, Whelan and the others leave their work in progress, put aside their current bread-and-butter -- books, articles, paintings, screenplays, etc. -- and go, because they promised they'd be there. And they don't charge money for it. They are a part of science fiction.

Actors who portrayed one SF role among many others are not a part of SF or fantasy. Tomorrow, an Elizabethan drama, or a Victorian mystery, or a Noel Coward comedy, or a modern psychodrama may turn up, and they will grab it. Which is as it should be. That's what they are supposed to be doing.

Think about this carefully.

If you bring people who thrive on applause from England; pay their way totally from airfare to hotel to bar bill to every bill; heap them with presents (many extremely expensive); ask the same inane quesions over and over about one particular role that they had in the past; worship at their feet: follow their every movement with total longing in your eyes; treat every word they say as the holiest of gospels - how can you possibly be surprised or angry that they develop a distorted view of what is happening, and at least some of them decide to try to turn this adulation into bread-and-butter!

It is their right to try to make money if they can. It is their right to refuse to attend other cons where they won't get paid. It is their right to try to sweet-talk American fans into volunteering to do the huge amount of work necessary for a professional tour (and to put up the financial backing too, no doubt). This has little to do with blacklisting or betrayal. It has everything to do with making a buck. And that really is okay.

It is your right not to volunteer your labor when others are being paid. It is your right not to attend, if you don't like the circumstances. It is your right to refuse to go along with a scheme to make someone else a buck. It is your right to be upset when you see your past work denigrated. It is your right to be angry when your friends are questioned quietly about you, rumors are spread about you, and no one has the courage to speak to you directly.

On the other hand, it is your right to volunteer if you wish. It is your right to attend as many of these productions as you wish. Be aware, however, that this has *little to do with fandom.* These would be proressional events, not fannish conventions. You want to join the worshiping crowds? It's a free country. Feel free.

But, PLEASE, stop confusing the actor with the role. Paul Darrow is NOT Kerr Avon. Darrow is a talented British actor who played this role years ago, among many others in his career. I would be interested in reading his post-SP novel, as I have read many versions (and will discuss them into the wee hours with you at a con). I am not interested in worshiping at his feet.

I honestly don't care if a professional tour is organized. I don't care if it kicks off on Labor Day weekend. It won't effect me at all. I'll be at World Con.

I do feel sad that Darrow has disrupted longstanding friendships among some; outraged that he has taken skills honed in that industry, and used them on fans. Fans, of all people! Not other actors, directors, entertainment bureaucrats - fellow professionals in his line or work - but on fans! I feel angry, but not surprised. I saw it coming way back.

SF fandom has been here for over 50 years. B7 fans, of which I am one (and which is one facet of my fannish activity), are a very small part of fandom. There are many cons every year. The major media fan con of the year never has any guests. Fandom will survive this tempest in a teapot.

Some people may lose their shirts though, on this proposed series of professional events. Some damned good organizing is going to be needed.

On the "charity" issue, I'm at odds with many people. I don't go to a con to give to charity. I give to charities that I support on my own time. If there's a surplus in the treasury, it should go back to the fans - in lower membership fees; better con facilities; more lavish con suite; good dead dog party; party seed to other people throwing parties during the con (soda, munchies, etc); rebate of membership fees to workers (often used at other cons); a den with decent food for the workers (especially valuable when they've worked unteen hours straight); T Shirts for the workers (also well known at many cons); fan funds for travel money for fans otherwise unable to attend (giftees to be voted on), in the manner of TAFF (Trans Atlantic Fan Fund) and DUFF (Down Under Fan Fund). These are some possibilites.

Concerning fanzines, these are privately printed and distributed, and not available to the general public. Adult zines (straight and slash) have disclaimers at the beginning, warning of the content. No one is selling adult zines door to door, or putting a gun to your head to force you to buy one. Adult fanfic is for adults. It's an adult game. If you feel personally offended by it, were raised on the equivilent of Tatooine, or just don't grasp it, then stay away from it. Print runs of 200 - 500 are obviously aimed at a very small group, compared to the overall numbers in media fandom, mainline fandom, and the mundane world.

There's too much to read in the world to waste time reading what you don't like. If you don't like it - don't read it.

ROLAND GAGNE Anaheim CA

TO OUR ESTEEMED EDITOR: You've laid out the problem very adroitly (REG: FAN vs PRO CONS) and are to be commended but I must say that I find your attacks against "profit" to be somewhat disturbing. You seem hell bent to attack this problem with a meat axe when a stiletto would be more appropriate. I feel that if you initiate total war with the PRO element, you may bethe first to die in the line of duty but it is "us" fans who will be transformed into the walking wounded and suffer a protracted, no-win war.

Taking your report as an accurate assessment a solution seems obvious - at least to me. By gathering the various zine editors, principal writers & artists together you can present a united front. With the leaders threatening to use the pen in ways which would boil down to Mutually Assured Destruction, the PRO element will be forced to at least *listen.* A mutually beneficial compromise is all that is necessary.

As you know, there are four basic elements to a convention. The Dealers' Room; Passive Entertainment; Active Entertainment; and Interactive Activities. The PRO and FAN elements can come totether in a joint partnership that would share the gate and also the convention's basic elements. Distribution of direct material/labor/overhead is better left to experts like yourself but I would like to comment on Entertainment/Activities. FAN organizers, by their very nature and love for B7, are best suited for Active Entertainment elements such as Fan Panels & Discussion/Debates and Interactive Activities such as Work Shops, etc. Let the PRO element take care of our budding primadonnas. What truely makes a convention (as you rightly pointed out) are fannish activities, not the stars. If the FAN faction controls those elements that fans actually desire, both the PRO & FAN factions can be satisfied and fandom preserved. Maybe I'm being naive and simplistic but I entered DOCTOR WHO fandom just in time to see the rotting corpse on the floor. As I am now about to step into B7 Fandom, I'd hate to find I'd walked into a pool of blood.

I think it rather telling that the PRO Cons rarely undertook to bring DW or B7 guests to the fans until FAN CONS brought them over here first and made them popular. And after "PRO" Cons got ahold of these guests, fees suddenly went UP.

By the way, accepting EXPENSES for any event, IS considered taking a fee. At least according to the IRS it is.

CREATIONS got ahold of BEAUTY & THE BEAST right off and "ownr" it hook, line and sinker to the point that a friend of mine attempting a small chat with Ron Perlman, was treated to having the man literally ordered away from her and pulled to a waiting car.

Granted he probably had a legitimate appointment, but there are better ways to treat both Fans and Guests.

SUSAN GLASGOW San Dimas CA

I must say I am deeply disappointed in the last issue of the FA. Your policy of "no personal attacks" was proper - and it was unwise of you to ignore it.

The statement that has been attributed to Ann Worthan was chilling in its ferocity. As a lesson in propaganda, it is very thorough, using many of the tried and true styles: Glittering Generalities - (fan run cons are utterly fantastic); Mudslinging - (professional cons are dreary rip-offs, and the "Guests" are so greedy that they would trample "dying children" in their haste for more money); Flag Waving - (we must save fandom from a fate worse than death), and Bandwagoning - (join me in fighting this evil).

Having Seen Paul Darrow's reply to this attack, I must say that I believe him when he says many of the statements attributed to him are misquotes, or out-and-out lies. His statement was logical in nature, making that anonymous statement seem even more hysterical by contrast. Also, consider that an anonymous statement that quotes anonymous and vague sources for proof, has offered no validation at all. We live in the age of advertising - give us some credit for spotting manipulation!

It was you who said that somebody wanted to "control" fandom and "that we will ask "How High" when they say JUMP!" That is so true; but can't you see that that is what you were attempting to do by publishing those two opening statements in the FA? You should have waited and confirmed the facts before you published those accusations. Yours and Ann's reputation have suffered a severe blow. Consider that if you continue with all this, your name will become infamous in fandom. Is this what you want to happen?

(BECOME infamous!? It would appear that people have been seeing to it that it already IS - and BEFORE this whole flap! ed).

All this had hurt Paul, Janet and all the other "Guests". It has also caused a lot of pain with the SNF. If certain BNF's aren't happy with B7 fandom, it would have been better to bow out gracefully instead of trying to destroy something that has brought a vast amount of pleasure to so many (not to mention the creativity and friendships that it has spawned).

This past weekend, the LA area had its bi-monthly meeting of B7 fans (roughly 26). Most had seen the anonymous statement and were confused and disgusted by it (for, as Americans, we have been taught to think for ourselves). When Paul's reply was circulated, their response was unanimous - they supported Paul. No matter what ugly rumors may get circulated atainst fans who come out in support of Paul *(as opposed to the ugly rumors that will come out about fans who speak out against Paul? ed)*, the SNF is still an independant entity and they will continue to draw their own conclusions. You can not control their thoughts.

In a related area concerning Leah Rosenthal's comments about the back-biting in B7 fandom: she never mentions who SHE is attacking, which has resulted in a kind of "insert the name of your villian of choice". In talking with friends (some in other parts of the country lest regional smear be attached), we have come up with four different names as to who we were SURE she was referring to. I think you will be unhappy to hear that your name was one of them referred to *(not as unhappy as Leah will be to hear it! ed).* (No, not by me - I felt sure she was referring to Laurie Cohen since I know about the deterioration of their once friendship).

Now, you said that you would not be printing any rebuttals to those two statements. That is also a bad mistake because it gives the impression that you are afraid to, that your arguments can not stand up to any opposition. It also invalidates the idea that the FA is a free forum for ideas. Is this what you want?

I hope you reconsider your position. Current popular opinion is that you were used. I mean, if you personally didn't hear what Paul was supposed to say, you had to be trusting your friends to to report faithfully and truly the events. If they didn't where does that leave you? Please rethink your position. And don't assume that what happened to Dr. Who fandom would have to be repeated in B7. There are way too many assumptions going on right now.

I rather imagine you won't print this, but I hope you will print a few of the protests you will probably be receiving.

I've known Annie since 1985 and I find it hard to believe that she would place herself in the line of fandom fire inorder to "use" me.

"We as American have been taught to think for ourselves." This is NOT Flagwaving? Yes, we think for ourselves, but we have to have BOTH sides of an issue before us to do so.

My personal attack policy said nothing will be printed "with SPECIFIC NAMES attached." And that "innuendo is in the eye of the beholder". To have printed Annie's statement with names attached was to invite libel action.

Annie's name was "witheld by request". A common enough action in newspapers. Yet Paul comes back attacking a specific name - Ann Worthan - when there was NO NAME attached to the article. How did he absolutely KNOW who had written it? And HIS attack is NOT "generalalities". He specifically targets Ann Worthan to the point of implying she's had access to Fan Con funds and mis-used same'

And how come it is that the collection of letters of support all four of them, sent out by DECINA PRODUCTIONS did NOT print Paul's rebuttal?

As for "bowing out gracefully": it is much more "honest" (and ultimately more difficult) to stay and fight. Leaving is easy; staying the duration takes courage. I've made my Statement, now I should run?

And where did "SHF" come from? I think a more honorable definition is "rank-and-file fans".

Besides, Ms. Glasgow, I don't know you. I DO know Annie. And she isn't MY only source. I do know fans you do not.

As you said, I had "to trust". It's a failing of mine. I trust until I'm back-stabbed then I put those people on a List of Those Who No Longer Matter To Me.

JEAN AIREY Aurora IL

I just want to be certain of something. It has come to my attention that "someone" is saying around B7 fandom that I "support" you and Anne. Please note, officially, for the record, that I don't.

If you contacted Paul & Terry "before" why didn't you wait until you had their answers before rushing to publication? At least printing several sides of the controversy in the same FA might have given some credence to your statement that you wanted a "dialogue" on "attitudes". And why is it suddenly that it's just "Terry's idea" that's a good one - from what I gather, both he and Paul pulled it together. And just *who* is responsible for this "perception" of Paul? The fans who stood around and talked with him for hours after the "scheduled" brunch? The fans who sat and chatted with him in the bar in Philadelphia? The fans who invited him to San Diego - and he came completely without fee? And you talk about the fans who are unwilling to confront #you# - how about the fans who are hiding behind anonymity and bad-mouthing #him#. Seems to me tht he didn't listen to what he was being told (whatever that was) until you launched this attack - and Linda, it is a very personal, nasty attack on an individual.

(And #this# attack on specifically-named Ann Northan is NOT!? ed)

A "Witch Hunt" for writers of "slash"? - Perhaps there was just some surprise on Paul and Janet's part that individual they felt they knew & that they felt knew how they felt about "slash" hadn't told them that they wrote it?? I've never been around when the subject was discussed - but apparently someone was and "agreed" with Paul on his opinion. I don't know if that was by silence or not, but I know of I'd been there and heard him I could not have, in good conscience, continued to write as a "friend" without clearing the air. And, Linda, please do not tell me that even 80% of B7 Fandom reads "slash" - 80% of B6 "fandom" doesn't even know that fandom exists - let alone read fanzines - let alone "slash". And even within the active, reading fandom - "Cheeseboard" has sold over 500 copies - if Anne's press run is what - 250 - there's 250 people who aren't buying her zines. Frankly, I think if Terry - disliking slash (and, apparently explicit straight as well) - can say, in effect, go ahead and publish, but stay away from cons where the guests are going to be embarrassed, you should recognize this attitude is one that very few creators of universes would take. Terry is the *owner* of the B7 universe, and, if he chose, could specify what was and was not acceptable to write/publish at all. Look at what would happen if you tried to write it in Marion Zimmer Bradley's universe(s), or Jacqueline Lichtenberg's, or - as Deb Walsh found out - in Tanith Lee's.

Who is out to destroy B7 fandom? I'm getting quite a different opinion of who to blame - and it's not the person the FA tried to pin it to.

Until you actually write and/or publish "slash" fiction, you don't really see how "large" that sub-fandom is. I should qualify my 80% - 90% of the zine-buying and zine-reading (the two are often mutually exclusive since there are half a dozen readers of every one zine sold) fans read slash - but a heck of a lot of them won't admit it.

And how come it is that only the writers of slash are the "sinners"? It has to be published in order to be read. And it wouldn't be published if it weren't bought and read. Nothing flies commercially if there isn't a Market for it.

As for the 250 fans who aren't buying Annie's zines because they bought "Cheeseboard" - when was a limit set on the number of zines a fan could buy?

Slash writing was never pushed at Paul and Janet - until the Con in Australia. When they went on to New Zealand, Kathy Hansen confirmed the names, and NOT in "silence". She practically boasts about it.

Please note, officially, for the record, I have never declared who "supports" me.

Marcia Parsons IL

"Federation Archives" in December/January. Although I do not subscribe to it, since I am not a member of the "Lost Sesta", I know many people who do subscribe. Contrary to the avowed intentions of the editorial, which are to "protect and warn fandom", the editorial has done little more but cause grave confusion and heated division. Since I am a fan of the show, I felt I should write to you with my opinion.

First of all, I am amazed that the writer of the editorial chose to remain anonymous to all but you as editor (I am assuming you actually know the author). Anonymity tends to beg a presumption of either shame in printing certain views, or fear of retaliation for those views, or a certain disbelief in what those views purport to be. All that means is, it is difficult to lend credence to someone who won't own up to his/her opinions. But this is a minor point.

The author seems to be of the belief that the only attendees at cons are there to see their friends and discuss the show. While I am sure tht that is the case for many fans, those that attend cons PRIMARILY to see the actors should not be belittled. These fans would attend ANY con, be it a "Creation" type of a "Scorpio" type. I fail to see what purpose is served to denigrate the "Creation" type cons. I am sure that many fans do not know, nor do they care, who is running a particular con, who is working on the con, or where the money from their ticket price is going. As long as the fans can afford to go, they will go.

The author states that he/she is looking to protect fandom from the greedy business-types who run "professional" cons. If indeed that is the author's true purpose, it is smothered beneath an avalanche of thinly-veiled gossip and innuendo which reads as a personal gripe against guests in general and B7 guests in particular. Most fans in the B7 universe adore the guests and always leave conventions feeling enchanted by spending a fewprecious moments whti their favorite star. But the author does little more than trash the guests - oh, let's be honest, it is quite obvious that one actor in particular is being referred to - the reference is quite apparent. This is the man who, in Oakland in early November, stayed over two hours past his scheduled time at a brunch so that he could talk with all the fans present. This is the man who gave autographs until everyone received one and then remained talking to fns in the dealers' room - all this after arriving at Oakland with a pained back. This is the man who, at San Diego, charmed everyone by attending a con (WITHOUT A FEE) at the last minute just to meet the fans there. Yet, this anonymous author sees "fit" to paint this man an an "overnight S.O.B." (my words, not the author's) for what? This does NOT protect fandom - quite the contrary, it is nothing more than "National Enquirer" -type inflammatory and unsubstantiated remarks, which anyone who knows this actor and has seen him at cons is quick to realize are total FABRICATIONS. The author him/herself bears this out by making loose reference to the supposed "sources" for the remarks, rather than directly naming and quoting these sources. As further information comes out, the "facts" stated in this article are shown to be, at the very least, misinformation, at the very worst, outright lies.

In your statement of editorial policy, you say that controversial articles will be permitted *(with SPECIFIC NAMES bandied about. ed)*. It amazes me that this article is not seen by you to be little more than that. No concrete evidence of a "clear and present danger" (to coin a phrase) to fandom is offered. I cannot see that such an article will help the fans. Certainly hearsay of this sort is better communicated by word of mouth, since the printed word is a serious medium which requires extra journalistic care of the highest ethic.

The author of this article has done little to advance the cause of fandom. As editor, you seem to hve joined in the apparent attempt to assassinate the character of one actor, with neither an attempt to verify quotes with the actor *(he declined by request. ed)*, nor with regard for those fans who have seen nothing from this actor but kindness and a fire desire to talk with them and entertain them.

JAMIE RITCHEY Houston TX

Here's my renewal. Sorry I can't contribute more. I'm definitely not a "rich" American. Come to think about it, I've never even met one of the critters. Coming from Texas sometimes gives us a double-whammy. People think we all have oil wells in our back yards. If I did, you can bet it would belong to somebody else, and all I'd get from it is the stink.

I beg your pardon, I'll get off my soap box now. It's just that those of us organizing fan-run cons are a bit miffed at a certain actor's attitude that we've been holding out on him all this time. He's welcome to look over our books anytime. The woman keeping them is an accountant for the IRS so you can bet every penny is accounted for.

I do know that the most fun I've ever had at any con is getting together with other fans. I never met anyone who was interested in the same things I was 'till I got involved in fandom. I do what I do for it because it's FUN. What more can anyone ask?

PAULA GROSS Michigan City IN

I read with interest your commentary in the Dec/Jan FA about the pro-con vs fan-con dilemma. Everyone is entitled to their opinion, and I respect yours. But, it has come to my attention that possibly you didn't get the whole story concerning the pro-fan issue.

I just received a rather large press release from *Decina Productions* (I imagine you got one too *((You bet. The package is made up of letters all sent to me FIRST! ed))* meticulously detailing each party's opinions, gripes, and ideas about the proposed fan-run but guest-being-paid-a-fee con tour idea. After mulling over this interesting document and re-reading your views from the FA, I must say that I think you jumped the gun a bit. I feel exactly the same way as you do though, about the pro-cons (CREATIONS), and being a DOCTOR WHO fan also, I am aware of what happened to their cons. Pure disaster for fans! So I felt I had to write and give you my opinions.

Pro-cons tend to want only the fast buck and damn the fans (who provide the fast buck). Fan-cons are organized by the people who love the show, actors, etc. I understand that. But this idea put out by Nation and Darrow seems to be a good one. It is good for both parties - guest and fan. I applaud all the B7 guests who showed up at cons in the past *gratis*, who thrilled and entertained the fans as well. But shouldn't we be giving something back to the progenators which started B7 - Nation the creator, Darrow the actor? As long as the con would be a fan-run effort and interested in putting the actor in touch with his fans, what would be so wrong about the guests getting a fee? (Nothing at all. *I never said they shouldn't be paid, only that they should request REASONABLE fees from Fan run cons because expenses alone can run over $2000. ed*).

Now, I think your comments were justified in part, though. *Perhaps they will* stimulate those of us in fandom to band together *instead of squabbling withourselves* and fight to keep B7 ours and ours alone. *As I mentioned before, do we want* B7 to end up as DW has? I hope not. I love B7 and especially its actors. The series and the actors have given me endless entertainment and much happiness throughout the years.

I think the problem is lumping together the pro-cons with this new (to me) concept of a fan-run and artist-organized con where both parties work together to make the con a success. How can it be a pro-con when the actors and the fans organize it out of their love for B7. How can you doubt Nation and Darrow?

Let's give the Nation/Darrow idea another look, ok? The idea is to bring the actors and the fans together. The actors have to live, to pay the bills just like us. There is no difference between us and them - acting is just their job, that's all. Perhaps we should considder thanking them for the enjoyment they've given us with a fee for appearances (just like an acting job would pay them, for in a way, they are acting at a con). But let it be a fan-run con for the fans and not turn it into a vast money-making machine. B7 is too precious to lose as we lost DW. Can we learn by our mistakes? Mr. Nation and Mr. Darrow are giving us a perfect opportunity to help keep B7 alive and pro-con free. Can we take that opportunity before it's too late. Let's use our icy Avon logic and not be ruled by our Blake (I'm on a mission from God, damn the torpedoes) all too human emotions.

As always, I like and respect you, Linda, and your FEDERATION ARVCHIVES. I think, however, we have to step back a bit and re-group. To use B7 jargon, we must fight the Federation (pro-cons) as they are a festering constrosity. We must ban together into one Freedom Party (fan-cons and actors) or we will lose something near and dear to us, to me.

As you say in the FA, no personal attacks, no fan feuds, rumor or unfounded accusations. I don't know who is "right", your version or the *Decina* version. It doesn't matter. What really matters is how to save B7 and it seems that Nation and Darrow*v care about that just as much as we fans do.* God bless them!

I hope when this letter reaches you, the problem I've written about will have been rectified. We must save B7 at all costs. Your friend and fellow B7 fan, whatever happens.

Did you notice that Paul's rebuttal was NOT included in the letters package from "Decina"?

I do seem to recall, that, among the "progenators" who "started" B7 was the number 7, as in more than 2.

I can agree with every one of your points. And I'll even agree that I have probably over-reacted. But at this point in time, a lot of my "devotion" depends on WHO is to "lead" the pro-fancon "Freedom Party". I cannot follow those whom I do not respect.

Their posturing on the slash writing issue made it clear I am not acceptable.

DORIS LUEBKE Lincoln ME

First, I have to address your printing of the statement about a well-known actor of B7 who is, I believe personally attacked in this statement, and also your editorial comments of the January FA letterzine. I believe it was grossly unfair to print such unfair comments without getting actual facts. It is not very wise to print idle gossip and rumors, what I can only perceive as jealous fans. These comments are obviously written about *Mr. Paul Darrow.* Since he attended three CREATIONS cons recently. I was not at the con where Mr. Darrow was supposed to have said the bit about 75 seconds with each fan, but I can assure you, that *had* to be taken out of context *(to be fair, it was. But the writer did say she was not present at the time. ed)*, and I am sure there is more to the story, than what was printed by whoever printed this gross statement.

I spent four days at Seattle, the con last May, where Mr. Darrow was one of the guests. He is NOT a money-grabber, there is not a greedy bone in his body. Paul would not spend 75 seconds with each fan. He's not that kind of guy. He is giving, caring, and courteous, concerned that all fans have a wonderful time. *I have never met a more caring person.* I had four days to observe his actions. True, I was not with him every second, but I had plenty of time to observe him. If the statement in your editorial were true, it would indeed be a great concern to all of us, I have been in B7 only a year now, and do not want it to go to the dogs, by mis-information (taken as fact, when it is only heresay). I don't believe anyone would try to control zines, there are so many ways around that kind of control. Your motto: "He's expendable, he's stupid and he's going" must be about Paul. So, are you out to expend PD? You got to be kidding! I don't believe anyone is trying to control the cons.

The motto was the writer's, not mine.

This is all the letter I received up to the time I had to go to press with this. To those of you whose letters reach me afterwards, my apologies. But I have to end this somewhere or I won't be able to afford to print it!

"UNWORTHAM'S LIES" by PAUL DARROW

This is a response - though it hardly deserves one - to an article circulated by Ms Annie Wortham.
If you have not read the article, or if you have read it and refuse to give it credence, you are to be congratulated. Otherwise, you may care to read on.

Ms Wortham's article discusses fan run conventions, with passing reference to others, and suggests that they and the fans who attend them have fallen prey to the mercenary attitudes of the, "stars", of, 'Blake's Seven', In addition, she attempts, scurrilously, to complete what is impolitely termed, 'a hatchet job', on one, "star", in particular.

It was not difficult to interpret her interminable prose and decide upon her target.

Unfortunately, Ms Wortham's dash into print has caused her to overlook any number of facts, to quote and misquote out of context and to indulge in a diatribe so full of hatred that it would be laughable, were it not so inept. In short - she is a liar!

However, liars are sometimes misguidedly believed, so let us look at some parts of her article.

Ms Wortham states - in reference to fan conventions - "In order to keep the guests happy, the fans' needs began to be ignored."

By Whom? By Ms Wortham and others like her, perhaps. Certainly not by me.

Let us tabulate a few more of her statements.

1. Referring to professional cons. "It's great for the guests; they hardly have to work at all and they get paid a <u>fee</u>."

"Dr Who", guests are always paid a fee. The same applies to, "Star Trek", etc. Professional conventions, by their very name, suggest that they are willing to pay fees to guests and, of course, make profits. It seems reasonable that the guests should share, however minimally, in those profits. Thus, I have accepted, 'generous expenses', from Creation conventions that, compared to any other guest's fee, would be considered derisory. In addition, I have not, 'hardly worked at all', but, as any of you who have attended Creation cons will know, I have always made myself available to anyone who cares to spend time with me. Why? Perhaps it is because I genuinely enjoy the company of, 'the fans'.

2. "Fan cons had to start paying many actors a fee".

Not to me they didn't! Of the many fan run conventions I have attended, *only two offered*, 'expenses'. These amounted to 500 dollars. 100 dollars to cover taxi fare in England, 150 dollars to cover compulsory insurance, 200 dollars to cover dog sitting fees - dogs have to be fed and looked after in one's absence. 50 dollars as agent's fee.

I would point out that similar sums are expended when, as is usually the case, no expenses are offered.

Also, it should be understood that time away from England is exhausting, debilitating and can result in loss of work at home.

Ms Wortham goes on to say that, in addition to a fee, actors required expenses. As illustrated, this is not true!

3. Actors, "began to demand business class or first class airfare."

I have never asked for, let alone demanded, first class fare.

I once asked for and twice was offered business class fare. Flying the Atlantic, particularly if one is involved in a show in England, can be arduous. In one instance, I was required to rehearse alleading role immediately upon my return to England from a convention. Thus, I had to get special permission from the management involved. They would have refused it if business class had not been offered and were surprised that I wasn't charging a fee for my appearance.

Ms Wortham then goes on to write - "never mind that every extra penny spent on their (actors) demands is a penny taken away from dying children or other worthwhile charities."

The accusation contained in the above sentence is beneath contempt!

4. "Many actors who used to pontificate about how they considered fans their, 'friends', are now copping a, 'star attitude".

Ms Wortham is entitled to her opinion and you, who have met me, are entitled to yours. It is true that I consider the majority of fans to be friends. It is unfortunate that Ms Wortham does not appear to be one of them.

5. "Ever wonder why certain actors never appear at Scorpio any more, even though Scorpio people were mostly responsible for promoting B7 in the US? Scorpio doesn't pay the actors a fee."

The reason that I do not attend Scorpio is because I was in V, not, 'Robin of Sherwood'. Also, it falls at a time when I have been in employment over the past few years. Also, I felt that the great success of Scorpio IV would be difficult to follow. I was right! All this was explained to Cherry Steffey and she, I hope, knows that I will always hold her in affection for all she did for B7. (Furthermore, I would not dream of attending any convention on Cherry's, 'turf', without her approval. She knows that too!)

6. "The truth is, the actors no longer <u>want</u> to mingle with the fans. They just want to make a buck."

Well, one certainly doesn't want to, 'mingle', with Ms Wortham! Others, though, may dispute her claim.

7. Ms Wortham misquotes me as saying, when entering a brunch, "I've only got to spend 75 seconds with each fan. I worked it out. That's all I'm getting paid for."

What I actually said was - "If the schedule remains as it is, I will only have 55 seconds to spend with each fan. Change the schedule." Due to circumstances beyond my control, the schedule could not be changed. Thus, I attended the brunch a quarter of an hour ahead of time, spoke with everyone and didn't eat brunch myself. My attendance was not compulsory - I offered to do it because I enjoy meeting as many fans as possible. (Ms Wortham was conspicuous by her absence. One wonders where she receives the quotations that she misinterprets into lies.)

8. Ms Wortham mentions a number of conventions proposed by Terry Nation and that would involve me.

It is because of the likes of Ms Wortham and the power plays and acrimony attributable to other, so called, Big Name Fans, that Terry and I thought it timely to try to return to the, 'real conventions'. Those that are conducted for the benefit of all, fans and guests alike, and that would exclude those who, like Ms Wortham, attempt exclusivity and preen themselves because they consider they hold a, 'special place', with the guests. If such a, 'special place', existed, clearly Ms Wortham is unworthy!

The proposed conventions would, hopefully, prove enjoyable for everyone. The actors who constantly make themselves available - Mr Nation, Mr Keating and myself - would be able to reciprocate your loyalty and affection in circumstances beneficial to all.

Ms Wortham suggests - "the aim is to put fan cons out of business."

What she really means is that she and her sycophantic friends would be put out of business. They would lose the, "exclusivity with guests", they have so assiduously sought and now, certainly in Ms Wortham's case, they so bitterly resent the loss. Hell hath no fury like a selfish fan scorned!

9. "Their aim is to control fannish literature."

Even if it were true, common sense tells us this would not be possible. Of course, what Ms Wortham attempts to write can hardly be described as, 'literature'. She writes, 'slash fiction', and dare not append her name to it!

10. Ms Wortham continues in describing venues for the, 'proposed convention tour'. Venues that have never been discussed or determined. She continues to speak with forked tongue. An exercise that is seemingly not unfamiliar to her!

11. She further asserts- "the organisers are going to assemble their own stable of approved artists who will be charged 50% commission for this privilege."

If we had not already established that Ms Wortham is a liar, this would surely prove her so.

12. She asserts that I - "intend to refuse to attend any other cons so, if you want to see him, you will have to come to his con and allow yourself to be ripped off and controlle

If anyone who has ever met with me at a convention feels That I would, 'rip them off', or 'control them', they should speak out now. Likewise, if any disagree with Ms Wortham's statement, they should speak out. *Her evil may triumph if the rest of you say nothing. After all, shouldn't there be Justice for all, including an English actor?*

In conclusion, Ms Wortham maintains that she, "won't allow the fans to be ripped off."

Really? She would seem more expert at it than I. How many conventions does Annie Wortham support - and have you ever studied their accounts?

There are many other sections of her article that are open to rebuttal. Suffice it to say that I take exception to being described as, "greedy", without proof. I am resigned to being damned with the phrase, "how charming he is."

Charm has never been one of Ms Wortham's qualities. As witnessed by the following phrase - " he's expendable, he's stupid and I'm not going. "

Whether I am expendable or not depends on you, dear reader. But, I am not stupid and know that the silver lining of B7 fandom would inevitably throw up a cloud such as Ms Wortham.

That she, 'is not going', is satisfactory to me. For, where shegoes and with whatsoever she has any connection, I will not go! She and her ilk are decidedly, '<u>not</u> safe with me!"

Forgive the length of this.

In the end, you must choose where you stand on this matter. Here I stand - I can say no more.

That you will express your support of me or of others, I have no doubt. It is the American way, as it is the English.

Dear

I would be very grateful if you would publish the above in your newsletter/magazine.

I feel it a shame I have been obliged to write it, but cannot let Ms Wortham's, Ms Terell's and others', comments go unremarked.

Yours,

<u>PAUL DARROW</u>

It would appear that Linda Terrell, through any number of communications, is inferring that, in the exalted company of Steven Spielberg and George Lucas, I am, "trying to control fan fiction".

Flattered though I am to complete such a triumvirate, the ludicrous suggestion is amazing. Such power would indeed be awesome!

Lest there be any, 'fans', misguided enough to lend Ms Terrell any credibility, however short lived, I must state a few facts.

I derive great pleasure from fan fiction. The work is almost unanimously excellent and often beautifully illustrated.

[illegible], slash fiction. I find tasteless and, when real names are used, a gross impertinence. But, if a minority wish to write, read and sell, 'slash', in a free world, that is their right. I don't have to pretend to like it, or keep my thoughts on the subject private - that is my right!

I asked Ms Terrell one question;- "If the authors of slash fiction are proud of their work, why do they not append their real names to it?"

She has declined to answer.

However, she does not display similar reticence when spreading illinformed rumours and indulging in malicious gossip on other matters connected with fandom.

The truth must be protected from her malign influence!

Janet Lee Price

The Darrows did not send me a copy of the letters they meant for distribution. I can only guess they assumed I wouldn't print them.

I did write to them regarding what was being attributed to Paul. I offered them a special issue of the FA in which to deny it and straighten it out.

I would like to reply to two allegations made in Janet's letter. The "control" I referred to I attributed to Paul as he was alleged to have used it in adjunct with zines and zine writing. That is also where I used the reference to Speilberg and Lucas.

I reiterate: Speilberg and Lucas tried to quash SW zines - and failed. So much for "awesome power".

Since returning from their Tour of Australia and New Zealand where they were given the names of several American slash writers by some "concerned" fan, Janet had been pressing me on it. Among her questions was, indeed, "why do they [slash writers] use pseudonyms?" I was also asked "Why" was it written and treated to several lines of how sick, and sad and terrible it was.

I did reply, very civilly and sincerely. *TWICE*. I tried to tell her why it was written and why pseuds were often used. I did not, however, rat on my fellow writers and give out names. I resented her pushing the subject again and again and asked her to "please" stop.

I was obviously disregarded.

But, obviously, some others don't give a second thought about betraying a confidence so the following is a Personal Editorial on:

SPIES WHO JUDGE US

By the way, I have been "warned" that if I use Paul's or Janet's (or another's) names in a derogatory manner, The Great White North may bring legal action against me. So from now on certain actors will hereinafter be referred to as "Mr. and Mrs. Actor" (however Mr. Actor himself wrote and told me I have the right to write and say whatever I wish. For which reaffirmation to the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, I am grateful):

Isn't is just heartening how some "concerned" fans will appoint themselves Judge, Jury, Executioner in order to "protect" the actors?

After four years of work in B7 fandom, I now have it in writing, from Mr. Actor hisself, that his view of me and, indeed, likely others, has long been tarnished by self-appointed, weiner fans "snitching" to them of my assorted "crimes". That "verbal incitements" against him have been attributed to me. That "all we have been told about you in the past" is true. That I am "undoubtedly a trouble-maker".

Because I dare call it as I see it. Well, excuuuuse me, but I'm nobody's "Yes" person! If I see something wrong, I say so. In print! Most of my opinions are in the FA for all to read.

But it would seem that there are those who have taken the attitude of "If you like Blake you must dislike Avon" to mean "If you don't like Avon then you must dislike Mr. Actor."

I detect a very strong odor of "toe the Party Line or you'll be turned in".

Or is it more like "Are you a Good Fan or a Bad Fan? Remember now, you must always say and do only the approved things and you must never, never point out the Emperor's new clothes or the Man behind the Curtain will get you."

And you can be sure that the self-chosen "tattlers" will run to him "tellin' on" who's been naughty or nice.

Think about it: how many of you have sat in on a "bitch session" and found your words cropping up all over?

Frankly, I find myself appreciating Avon more and more. He was a man of honor.

Some may see snitching as "concern".

The weasels may justify it as "protecting Mr. Actor".

I call it what it is: "sucking up" - by Fan Quislings. (Look it up).

Yet not a one of the "informants" has ever had the GUTS to confront ME!

So, now Mr. and Mrs. Actor have been told I write - gasp! - slash!

But I haven't had the "guts" to put my real name on it!

Why do some actors use pseudonyms? Are they ashamed of their families?

Why is B7 slash still written even though we know Mr. and Mrs. Actor disapprove? Well, why does he act? Why do artists draw? Why do writers write? Why do all we strive to attempt something new and different?

The Challenge.

95% of the straight writers write slash.

99% of the zine publishers publish slash.

Slash has been around for years in all media fandoms. It's been a part of B7 since before I came to the fandom in early 1984. And Mr. Actor has known about it for years. So why now the sudden "witch hunt"?

That attitude is why some slash writers took pseuds in the first place. 1. it seemed "kinder" somehow not to throw it in certain actors' faces that their fan chums actually wrote naughty nookie; "admitting" it would have been seen as "flaunting it" and not a one of us believes we would have been met with understanding and forgiveness. 2. homophobia, see "Witch Hunt", above. 3. some slash writers are gay men who lust after Avon as much as any "straight" female. 4. some writers live at home with parents. 5. some writers could find their jobs and/or standing in a small community in jeopardy should it get out that they write homo-erotica. But, of course, none of this ever occured to Mr. and Mrs. Actor.

Again I detect an odor...

Good little fans are supposed to toe the Party Line and turn in the "rebels".

Is there a two-for-one sale on self-esteem?

Is isn't a simple question of why do we "hide" behind pseuds? It is now becoming wanting nothing less than our virtual "confessions".

What next? Wear Stars on our chests?

And one of the "accused" is supposed to rat on the others?

I do not carry confidences.

But the people who do, the "snitchers", are the people the Actors' actions are telling us they prefer to deal with, listen to and believe. Yet Mr. and Mrs. Actor are incensed when we no longer wish to do business as usual with them!

How many other fans are on a "Hit List"? How many other fans have had their way impeded, their reputations tarnished because some cheap, gutterspiping apostate decided they weren't the "right kind" of fan?

How are we to respect people like that? Or do business with them? Or respect and do business with people who do?

Is there that large a cultural and intellectual gap between the United States and England?

Shame on Mr. and Mrs. Actor. And shame on the "Yes" people.

But, remember, I'm just a "trouble-maker".

DAMN STRAIGHT!

This ADDENDUM is not going out to the Darrows since I have been invited never to darken their mailbox again. However, I have no doubt that copies will find their way to Paul and Janet.

Enough said.

A parting word to those "open minded" fans among you who are cancelling out of FREEDOM CITY because Annie and I are "associated" with it. How convenient for you that Paul isn't going to be at FC after all - and hasn't been schedulled for some time because of the play he's going to be in at that time. Because if Paul Darrow were still going to be at FREEDOM CITY, you know damn well that the lot of you would be there even if it were being run by the Inquisition and the PLO!

Cancelling out isn't "protesting" - especially when it puts Marion McChesney in very real danger of going bankrupt. It's BLACKMAIL!

A little honesty, please! "Don't speak up before GAMBIT, it might hurt the Con. Oh, now don't speak out before FREEDOM CITY, it might hurt the Con. Oh, but you can't speak up before SCORPIO, it might hurt the Con."

So, it's shut up and 'go along' with the mob? Sorry, but that's a one-way street, no right turn on red.